

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 476.—JULY, 1923.

Art. 1.—CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS.

*Der Katholizismus, Seine Idee und seine Erscheinung.*  
By Friedrich Heiler. München, 1923.

PROF. FRIEDRICH HEILER, of Marburg, is, in the opinion of men well qualified to judge, the most outstanding among the younger theologians of Germany. He is well known as the author of a standard work on Prayer ('Das Gebet'), which has passed through several editions; and he has now republished, in a much enlarged form, a comprehensive study of Roman Catholicism, which is probably the most important book on the subject. The Professor has lately left the Church of Rome to become a Lutheran; but he retains a warm affection and admiration for the Catholic system, and explains in a masterly way the many-sided attractiveness of that majestic institution, which appeals to nearly all the religious instincts of human nature. Heiler was driven out of the Roman communion by the disciplinary measures taken by the Vatican against the Modernists. It does not appear that he was personally censured; but he is an ardent disciple of George Tyrrell and Archbishop Söderblom of Upsala, and still more, perhaps, of Baron Friedrich von Hügel, who must certainly be ranked as a Modernist, though this profound and loyal lay theologian is too great an asset to his Church to be molested. Heiler writes with burning indignation of the fate of Tyrrell and his friends, but he makes no attempt to defend Loisy, the great Biblical critic, and even denies that he has had much influence on the Modernist movement. The unflinching condemnation of Modernism by

Vol. 240.—No. 476.

## 2 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

the Pope made it impossible for Heiler to remain a Catholic without denying his convictions and deserting his friends.

The main facts about the Modernist controversy are well known. The group of men whom Pope Pius X called Modernists are, or were, some of them philosophers and some New Testament critics. In the latter capacity they tend to accept the extreme destructive position, holding with Loisy that the historical Jesus was merely an enthusiastic prophet who went about preaching that 'the Kingdom of God'—a supernatural cataclysm which would bring the world-order to an end—was close at hand. All the supernatural elements in the Gospel narrative are either openly rejected or tacitly set aside. Albert Schweitzer's one-sided insistence on the so-called eschatological (apocalyptic) character of Christ's teaching has had a strong influence upon the Modernists. The historical Jesus, according to these critics, founded no Church and instituted no Sacraments; the real founder of Catholicism was St Paul, who inaugurated the cult of the Lord Christ (*Kyrios Christos*), and thereby gave the new religion a form which was intelligible to the Hellenistic population of the Roman Empire. The Church grew, like any other organism, by responding to its environment; it adapted itself to human needs, and gave scope for the unchanging popular religion of the Mediterranean peoples to find expression within its comprehensive system. Since religion is fundamentally 'irrational'—Heiler repeats this statement many times—it can easily survive the loss of its factual basis. The fatal error of Catholic theology has been the attempt to find a rationalistic foundation for faith.

That this treatment of the historical Founder of Christianity is 'deeply repulsive to the large majority of believers' is admitted by Baron von Hügel; but the more drastic Modernists maintain that it is, or soon will be, forced upon us by honest criticism; and their anti-intellectualist philosophy helps them to face the crisis with equanimity. Christianity, as Tyrrell said, is at the cross-roads. The arguments from miracle and prophecy are gone. The 'historical' articles in the Creeds are, for the Modernists, myth, not fact. The claims of the Roman Church are buttressed by fraud. And lastly, the official

philosophy, that of St Thomas Aquinas, is quite out of date, being based on preconceptions which modern philosophy has rejected. Either, then, Catholicism must be abandoned, or it must justify itself by a new apologetic. Tyrrell, in a letter which he did not mean to be published, used the strong phrase, 'Catholicism must die to live.'

The Vatican made no terms with its dangerous defenders. Modernism was pronounced to be 'a compendium of all the heresies,' and its theses were anathematised in detail. A very searching anti-Modernist oath was, and still is, exacted, which was intended to make it impossible for any Modernist to hold office in the Catholic Church, except by deliberate perjury. Loisy protested that it is impossible to kill ideas by a *coup de bâton*, but he seems to have become convinced that his position was really incompatible with membership of a Christian Church, and accepted a lay professorship. Other members of the school considered themselves deeply injured by being branded as heretics, and protested their loyalty and devotion to Catholicism. Heiler's position, as will be seen, is peculiar. He thinks that the Church in becoming Roman has ceased to be Catholic. Since the Reformation it has, he says, been growing steadily narrower, till it has lost the right to speak in the name of 'universal' Christianity.

The question whether the Church has, since its very beginning, substituted a mythical figure for the martyred prophet of Galilee must be argued as a problem of historical criticism. Liberal theology in this country sees no reason to accept the position of Loisy and Schweitzer. The present writer has elsewhere stated some of the difficulties which the advocates of the theory fail to meet; the matter cannot be discussed here. To the Protestant, the severance of the Church from its roots in the Person of the Redeemer would be a blow from which his faith could not recover; official Catholicism is equally emphatic to the same effect. But it will be well to let Heiler speak for himself, since we must not attribute the same opinions to all members of the school.

Heiler gives us a sketch of the entire history of Catholicism from the first century to the present day.

#### 4 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

His survey covers the same ground as Auguste Sabatier's '*Religions d'Autorité et la Religion de l'Esprit*', but he never mentions the work of the French scholar, which is in truth a bitter anti-Roman polemic. A comparison between the two books is nevertheless very interesting and instructive.

The author, though he follows Schweitzer in holding that the essential part of Christ's message was the near approach of the 'Kingdom of God,' does not disparage the rest of the Gospel message as mere '*Interimsethik*.' He finds in the Gospel a revival, 'pure and strong, of the most precious heritage of Israel, the religion of the prophets.' He also points out that the Judaism of Palestine at the beginning of our era was already affected by 'Greek wisdom, esoteric asceticism and mysticism, and Platonic ideas.' Since, however, the teaching of Christ, as he admits, shows no traces of these accretions, it is doubtful whether he has the right to speak of 'a background of syncretistic religion' in the Gospel. The Judaism of Palestine differed widely from the Judaism of the Dispersion. It is much more important that Heiler fully recognises the universal and revolutionary character of Christ's teaching. 'He lays the axe to the root of Judaism,' and 'not less tears to pieces all exclusive Christian churchmanship.' 'Jesus overcame the traditional religion, though without a formal breach.'

Heiler thus emphasises what might be called the Protestant character of the Gospel; he does not leave much standing of the Catholic claim that Christ instituted the Catholic Church. 'Salvation (in the Gospel) lies alone in faith, hope, and love; faith in God's mercy, hope in the eternal kingdom, and self-sacrificing love. These are not bound up with institutional religion; they make their own way to the kingdom of heaven.' Jesus resembled Savonarola, but 'unlike Savonarola, He stood above all Churchmanship, independent of institutions.' 'He is inwardly indifferent to every Church-ideal.' 'Inwardness and brotherly love break down all the barriers of legal and ritual Church-religion.' 'The Gospel is super-ecclesiastical and unecclesiastical; His judgment on the Jewish Church is valid also against the Christian Church of the later centuries.' 'The use of the word

Ecclesia in St Matthew is unhistorical; Jesus can never have said this' (Matt. xvi, 18). 'The words about binding and loosing have been transferred from another context.' 'Jesus gave no primacy or privileged position to any of His apostles.' 'The commission of primacy to Peter is plainly an interpolation.' 'The Gospel of Christ and the Roman World-Church are united by no inner band; a gulf yawns between them.' 'The Catholicising of Christianity begins immediately after the death of Jesus. The Pentecost is the birthday of the Catholic World-Church; not the man Jesus, but the Kyrios Christos and His Spirit founded the universal Church.'

These are precisely the arguments which lead the Protestant to reject the Catholic position as historically untenable; but to the Catholic Modernist they cause no uneasiness. 'If you want to establish the identity of an individual,' says Loisy, 'it is not necessary to squeeze him into his cradle.'

'The system of Catholic dogma has its root in the Pauline myth of the Son of God.' (By a 'myth' Heiler says that he means 'a fact-like historical picture' or 'symbolical narrative'—phrases which he borrows from Baron von Hügel.) St Paul is also the father of Catholic mysticism; through him 'the Orphic-Platonic piety,' with which the Hellenistic world was 'saturated,' was permanently amalgamated with Christianity. St Paul 'lived in the higher world of the Spirit, the world of mystical inwardness.' 'The whole Christ-drama of salvation passes into this mystical inner life'; the whole process of Christ, His death, resurrection, and ascension, must be re-enacted in the personal experience of the Christian. Therewith came a certain indifference to the merely historical aspect of the revelation: 'though we have known Christ after the flesh, henceforth we know Him so no more' (2 Cor. v, 16).

In the later books of the New Testament, the Pastoral Epistles and the Gospel of Matthew, we find another spirit. 'The Pastoral Epistles are the first document of narrow and stiff Roman Churchmanship.' The editor of our First Gospel has also done much to turn the announcement of the Kingdom of God into the proclamation of a legal ecclesiastical system. It has been the favourite Gospel of the Roman hierarchy, which finds in it its

most impressive texts. 'The Apocalypse is "the first document of the Catholic popular (vulgar) religion." ' Old Oriental cosmology, Jewish eschatology, Chaldaean astrology, Assyrian number-symbolism, Hellenistic magic and Sibylline prophecy, Persian dualism and Christian belief in redemption, are here thrown together in a chaotic syncretism.' Most of these elements lived on in the popular religion of the Middle Ages.

The Fourth Evangelist is neither a missionary nor an ecclesiastic; he is a mystical theologian, the Origen of primitive Christianity. The Johannine Christ is a figure of unmoved, passionless majesty; the picture makes a strong appeal to Buddhist students. The nameless disciple, who leaned on Jesus' breast, is the mystic, who penetrates furthest into the secrets of the Divine. The piety of this Gospel is 'Gnostic Mysticism,' if we may use the word Gnostic, as Clement did, as a title of honour. Nevertheless, the Evangelist is a loyal Catholic: 'the mother of Jesus' is an allegory of the Church, and 'Peter' of Church authority. (Heiler, we think, is mistaken in attributing a half-magical sacramental doctrine to this Evangelist, who, on the contrary, carefully dissociates his sacramental teaching from the rites, and describes only one institution of a sacrament, namely, the feet-washing, which never established itself in the Church as a recognised 'mysterium.') 'The dogma of the Incarnation is the great creation of this writer.' For the rest, his Gospel of love is the genuine Gospel of Christ; and the Reformers naturally prized 'St John' above all the other Evangelists. The 'native air' of this treatise is of course not Palestine, but 'the Alexandrian religious world.'

Heiler next traces the development of Catholicism during its 'campaign on two fronts,' against Marcion and the Gnostics. Gnosticism was a 'hot-house growth,' which the early Church could not incorporate without danger; Marcionism was an attempted return to the primitive Gospel. The Church steered a middle course between them, borrowing something from both, but continually strengthening the hands of authority and checking the 'liberty of prophesying.' In this kind of statesmanship Rome took the lead.

The Alexandrian philosophy of religion is not much

to Heiler's taste. He begins to talk about 'intellectualism,' that bugbear of modern thought, which it is the custom to attribute to the Greeks. The Platonic school, to which Catholic theology is so much indebted, is certainly not 'intellectualist' in the disparaging sense. The organ of divine knowledge (*νοῦς*) is not the logic-chopping faculty, but the whole personality unified by a discipline which is at least as much moral as intellectual, for the quest of truth, goodness, and beauty. The root-principle of Platonism, as of all Christian mysticism, is that spiritual things are spiritually discerned, so that the soul must commit itself whole-heartedly to the upward path before it can form true conceptions of supersensual reality. Certainly the statement that religion is 'irrational' would seem to Platonists and mystics of all ages nothing less than treason against our highest endowment. The 'seven gifts of the Holy Spirit' are gifts of intellectual enlightenment, and have always been recognised as such by the General Councils, which opened with a special invocation of the Holy Ghost. Heiler's notion that Catholic philosophy lost sight of faith and love in verbal disputations is quite untrue. The Catholic theologians never, in theory at least, forgot the truth which they learned from Plotinus, that the mind (or spirit) *in love* can alone reach the full attainment of divine knowledge. Heiler regards Origen as the founder of Scholasticism; but he reserves his strongest censures for St Thomas Aquinas, whose theology is still authoritative in the Church of Rome. The whole of the 'proofs of God's existence,' and the rest of the demonstration which claims to establish by the light of reason the fundamental principles of religion, Heiler regards as a disastrous blunder, an attempt to rationalise the irrational. He reminds us of what of course is true, that the mental state of the philosophic theologian is quite different from that of the saint at prayer. Spiritual experience is not gathered by dialectic; no one ever supposed that it was; but it is difficult to understand how an earnest and candid mind can be content to leave religious convictions entirely uncoordinated with human knowledge, a mere mass of emotions nowhere in contact with external fact. When we remember how Heiler and his school have dealt with the Jesus of history,

## 8 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

we can only read with amazement such a sentence as this: 'The living Christ-piety, the belief in the incarnate Son of God, the following of the poor and meek Jesus, the love of the heavenly Saviour and bridegroom of the soul, the prayers to the eternal Christ as the King of Kings—all this has nothing to do with the *Christuspanz*, for which the traditional apologetic strives. As the God of speculative dogmatics is other than the God of devout piety, so the Christ of apologetics and dogmatics is other than the Christ of real piety.' It is plain that 'the object of real piety' is for this school a Being who never existed. It is enough to say that the early Church was quite familiar with cults of non-historical dying and rising Saviour Gods, and suffered persecutions because it refused to have anything to do with them or to recognise any truth in them.

Scholastic theology was, as we all know, the child of an utterly unscientific and half-barbarous age. It attempts to prove some things that cannot be proven, and other things that we now know to be untrue. Some Thomists are justly accused of that abuse of logic which consists in moving counters about as if they were known entities with a fixed connotation. But to condemn their whole method and object is 'misology' of the worst description. Even the famous 'proofs of God's existence' were not killed by Kant; they may all be stated in forms which are still valuable and even cogent.

After the concordat with the State in the reign of Constantine, the Church was rapidly paganised. 'The whole ancient piety, with its magical Beings, its cult of gods and heroes, its fear of demons and its belief in miracles, clothed itself with a thin Christian dress and so found entrance into the consecrated precincts of the Church.' The expiring heathen temple-liturgies took a new life within the Church, and brought its rites nearer to the old worship of the temples. The priest became a privileged official and mystagogue. Before long, the ancestral religion of the barbarian invaders began to exert its influence. 'German heathenism, Aristotelian logic and metaphysics, and the mysticism of Dionysius the Areopagite, are the new factors which the mediæval Church took into its bosom.' In Gregory the Great this 'vulgar Catholicism' becomes authoritative. 'The

Catholicism of the present day is more the creation of the Christian Middle Ages than of Christian antiquity.'

This is perhaps the best place to consider Heiler's conception of the essence of Catholicism. It is, he says, essentially a comprehensive religion, a *complexio oppositorum*. Of the Eastern Church he says, 'the combination of these heterogeneous elements makes it Catholic, and has enabled it to endure during all the centuries.' Again, 'Catholicism has proclaimed the whole gay congeries of religions, which it embraces, as genuinely Christian.' It not only incorporated the whole religious philosophy of the Neoplatonists, but all the popular beliefs of the half-heathen masses. This unlimited hospitality is for Heiler the note of true Catholicism. The power of assimilation has been gradually lost, and so Rome is no longer truly Catholic.

To the present writer, this seems to be a misconception of the part which Catholicism has played in history. The name Catholic indicates universal extension in a geographical sense rather than intellectual comprehensiveness. So far from desiring to include heterogeneous and irreconcilable elements, the Church defined its position mainly by the exclusion of errors, and endeavoured from the first to leave no contradictions unsolved. The 'narrowness' which to our author seems a modern error was in reality present from the first. For example, there never was a time at which the statement that the historical Christ was purely human ( $\psi\lambda\delta\zeta \acute{a}v\theta\rho\omega\pi\o\zeta$ ) was not anathematised. Judaisers, Pagans, Gnostics, Arians, and even Nestorians were condemned. No compromise was made with the popular 'Religions-gemenge,' which was then called *theocrasia*. If we put aside for the moment the political evolution of Catholicism, on which more must be said presently, and regard it as a religion consisting of a body of beliefs, we find that the Church belongs quite definitely to a particular type of religion and even to a particular type of thought, and does not try to make room for all religion, nor for all philosophy. It is, for example, a system of personal theism, a supernational religion, an other-worldly religion, a religion of brotherly love. It does not deny that there is much which is noble and valuable in Buddhism which denies the first of these, in

## 10 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

Judaism which denies the second, in Positivism which denies the third, and in the creed of self-culture which dispenses with the fourth. But it does not try to include these religions; they are not Christian.

In the same way, Catholicism is not hospitable to every philosophy. It is, as Troeltsch says, the last creative achievement of classical antiquity, the heir of Greek thought. The whole structure of Catholic dogma, apologetic, and philosophy is built upon the foundation of Greek speculation and Greek mental discipline. It is impossible to tear them asunder, because there never was a primitive Church unaffected by Hellenistic ideas. They are apparent in the earliest books of the New Testament. They determined the dogmas and creeds of Christendom. They imposed upon the Church an eschatology which is incompatible with the Jewish beliefs of the first Christians. They introduced into the Church that combination of speculative thought, ascetic discipline, and mystical intuition which belongs essentially to the Platonic tradition. Now this Catholic philosophy, which is a continuation of the thousand years of unfettered debate which the Greek race enjoyed before the closing of the schools of Athens, has a quite definite character of its own. It is rationalistic, and also mystical, like the philosophy of the Neoplatonists. A Platonist need not be a Christian, still less a Catholic; but the main presuppositions on which Christian philosophy has always been based are also his.

Aristotelianism is a more questionable ally of the Christian faith. It is significant that the scholastic semi-Aristotelianism, which was before long accepted by the Church, was at first received with suspicion. Heiler quotes with satisfaction the letter which Pope Gregory IX wrote to the Professors of the University of Paris in 1223, condemning the Modernists of the 13th century as severely as the Encyclical 'Pascendi dominici gregis' condemned Loisy and his school. 'Some of you, distended like a bladder with the spirit of vanity, busy yourselves in altering the limits laid down by the fathers with profane innovations . . . inclining to the teaching of natural philosophers. Misled by various and strange doctrines, they put the head where the tail ought to be, and force the queen to serve the maid-servant. And while they

endeavour to buttress the faith by natural reason more than they ought, do they not render it, in a manner, useless and empty?' The Pope exhorts them not to bedizen the spouse of Christ with rouge and extraneous ornaments, but to 'teach theological purity without the ferment of worldly science, not contaminating the word of God with the figments of philosophers.' The Church distrusted rationalism untempered by mysticism. Like its precursor, Neoplatonism, it neglected the scientific studies to which Aristotle devoted much of his life, and feared that science would end by undermining the supernatural. It was a crisis in Christian thought, and we see that authority, after an unsparing condemnation, admitted the new learning as a bulwark of orthodoxy. But Aristotle the natural philosopher was never really accepted. The Schoolmen were less of Aristotelians than they supposed. Some of the doctrines and treatises which they believed to be Aristotle's really belonged to the later Platonists. The Schoolmen, too, had no desire to make philosophy anything more than an *ancilla fidei*; they were anything rather than dangerous rebels. They did nothing to prepare the Church for the great decision which it had to make in regard to the discoveries of Copernicus and Galileo. With hardly a qualm, authority then came down on the side of obscurantism, and ever since, the faithful have been condemned to live in a pre-Copernican universe, from which they can only escape by formal heresy or obvious inconsistency. This, however, is not because the Schoolmen and their successors were rationalists, but because, like the Middle Ages in general, they were timid traditionalists. They did not know that a great Renaissance was dawning.

Heiler shows a bitter hostility to the philosophy of the Middle Ages, and the grounds of his dislike throw much light on the character of Modernist thought. We have to remember that logic had a much larger place in mediæval education than it has in our own day. With us, natural science is more and more the basis of all constructive theories of history and philosophy; but in the Middle Ages, when there was no natural science worthy of the name, right reasoning—*recta ratio*—was the *preambula fidei*. The scholastic apologists felt, surely rightly, that a supernatural revelation must have at

## 12 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

least a foundation within the domain of human reason, and it was by logic that they attempted to demonstrate the essentials of the theistic position. Heiler objects that these proofs, even were they more valid than they are, do not lead us to 'the God of living piety.' 'The God of living piety is excluded from all possibility of rational proof, because He is essentially irrational.' Rational proof may demonstrate the existence of the Absolute, but 'the introduction of proofs of the existence of the Absolute into theology is a dangerous error, which has bitterly revenged itself in later times.' 'The proofs of God's existence have never brought any one to believe in God, but have torn belief in God out of the hearts of many.' In the same way the philosophical arguments for the immortality of the soul are a very poor substitute for the belief in the Kingdom of God. 'Rational philosophy stands here also in a totally different sphere from irrational faith.'

We naturally ask—while apologising for the absurd form which the question must necessarily take—what reasons there are for believing the irrational? We can imagine two answers, but it is difficult to find any clear explanation in Heiler. It might be said: Since knowledge of things as they are is entirely beyond our capacity, it is our wisdom to believe, or to behave as if we believed, whatever helps us to live as we wish to live. If any belief ceases to help us, we may give it up and try something else. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Whatever helps souls may be called true. This is pragmatism; it goes back to Protagoras, with his maxim, 'Man is the measure of all things.' Some of the Modernists have coquettishly adopted this philosophy, which is popular in America. In that country 'bluff' is so successful that men are not without hope that they may bluff nature and its Author. But it is difficult to imagine any view of life more incompatible with Christianity.

The other possible answer is that we know God by mystical intuition, which makes reason superfluous. Heiler actually appeals to Plotinus in support of this reply: God is 'beyond thought' (*ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ νοήσεως*). There could hardly be a more fundamental misunderstanding of mystical philosophy. The Absolute, whom

Heiler dislikes so much, is said by the mystics to be 'beyond Being and beyond thought'; he is the ultimate unity, the One, who is presupposed in all distinctions, even in the distinction between thinker and thought. It is not necessary to quote the language in which writers like Plotinus, Dionysius, Erigena, and Eckhart have tried to express the absolute transcendence of the Godhead as He is in Himself. It is also true that the life of the beatified spirit, which can be experienced in a measure by the mystic on earth, is lived in a higher atmosphere than that of discursive reason. 'The soul that has become spirit,' as some of these writers express it, is in more immediate correspondence with eternal and spiritual reality than can be attained by mere dialectic. This is enough to disprove the charge of 'intellectualism,' but it by no means implies that the mystical quest is 'irrational.' If the mystic were not convinced that the heaven of his desire exists objectively and independently of himself, he would at once cease to be a mystic; and if he did not believe that the quest to which he is committed involves the consecration of the intellectual faculties no less than of the will and affections, he could not believe, as he does, that only the unified personality can come into touch with the Godhead. The dictum of Plotinus that to aspire to rise above intelligence is to fall outside it shows how determined he is to take no short cuts to the beatific vision. The best Catholic theologians reject explicitly the argument of 'ontologism,' the claim that immediate and irrefragable certainty of the being of God is granted to us. The proof of God's existence is for them in the nature of a valid inference. The life of faith is justified to the intellect by this conclusion of the reason; but it remains a venture, without which it would not be faith. The venture is progressively justified by spiritual experience, which at last reaches intuitive certainty. The spiritual ascent gives as it were new data on which a true philosophy can be founded. Our earlier provisional syntheses may have to be discarded in the light of higher and fuller knowledge; but never, even in the highest stage, does faith become irrational.

There seems to be a curious dualism in the mind of the Modernist. In dealing with history, he is an extreme

## 14 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

rationalist. He rejects the notion that there was anything unique or supernatural in the career of Jesus of Nazareth ; he would, one imagines, not dissent from the harsh statement of Loisy that the historian does not banish God from history ; he never meets Him there. And yet he values the creeds, the sacraments, and the liturgy of the Catholic Church, which are based on the belief that in the historical Christ 'dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.' The Catholic worship is for him, we must suppose, symbolic : it represents spiritual truths which can move our affections and imaginations only when they are translated into these images. Now we must all admit that we see through a glass darkly, and know only in part. But is it not a matter of experience that as soon as we see that an alleged miracle is only a parable, it loses its value for us as a miracle, and becomes only an aid to the imagination, or more often even a hindrance ? To the 'vulgar Christian' (the phrase is less offensive in German), Catholicism guarantees facts, past, present, and future. To the man in the street the alternative is fact or fraud ; and in view of the powers claimed by the priesthood, which depend on the factual truth of their doctrines, it is difficult to deny that this is the alternative. Heiler seems to say in effect, 'All that the rationalists say is true, but it does not matter.' But we live in a scientific age, which will not readily agree that the question is irrelevant whether an event which is presented to us as immensely important ever went through the form of taking place.

Heiler traces the development of post-Tridentine Catholicism with growing disapprobation. After the Reformation the Church became narrower, and no longer produced men of genius like Augustine, or even like Thomas Aquinas. Its most outstanding figures are Ignatius of Loyola and Alfonso of Liguori, in whom 'vulgar Catholicism' overwhelms the mystical and evangelical elements of Christianity. The Prussianism of Ignatius is briefly but sufficiently sketched. In Alfonso of Liguori Catholicism seems to him to have descended to a still lower plane. This modern Catholic saint is the author of the statement, 'It is difficult to be saved through Christ, but easy through Mary.' His extra-

gant Papalism is the main reason why his works, which Döllinger stigmatised as 'a magazine of errors and lies,' have been made authoritative, and exalted to the level of the earlier doctors of the Church.

There is much in this book which we must leave without comment, though it is full of interest—a sympathetic elucidation of the liturgy, discipline, and institutions of the great Church which the author quitted with so much sorrow. In some ways, these chapters are the most illuminating in the whole volume. But our space is needed for a judgment on the book as a whole. We have dealt with the Modernist attitude towards history and dogma, and have not disguised our conviction that Rome would have committed suicide by admitting and sanctioning a disintegrating philosophy of religion, the tendency of which would have been to change Catholicism into a religion of a different type, depriving it both of the advantage which gave it the victory over Isis and Mithra—its basis in history, and of its philosophy, in which it affiliated itself to the great Hellenic tradition. Nevertheless, Tyrrell was right in saying that the Church of Rome stands at the cross-roads. It is encumbered by an immense mass of falsified history and antiquated science, which it cannot repudiate, and which it can no longer impose upon its adherents, except where its priests still control and stifle education. The plea that truths of fact and truths of faith are different things, which do not conflict because they are on different planes, certainly suggests a way out. It is a way which would lead the Roman Church to destruction; but perhaps no other solution of the problem is in sight. Mere repression may force men to unsay; it cannot make them unsee.

It remains to consider whether the history of Christianity in general, and of Western Catholicism in particular, does not suggest rather different conclusions from those which lie at the root of Heiler's position. And first of all, the unwelcome fact must be faced, that to find a form of religion which shall be acceptable to all the great races of mankind, divided as they are by immemorial differences of mental structure and ancestral customs, is a problem which, if not insoluble, has never yet been solved. The Gospel of Christ Himself, we may

## 16 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

gladly admit, speaks in his own tongue to the Greek and the Roman, the Teuton and the Celt, the white man and the black. But this cannot be said of any institutional Church. Just as Buddhism, in gaining China and Burma, lost India, the home of its origin, so the Christian Church, in gaining for Christ the whole domain of Græco-Roman culture, lost its power of appealing to the Semitic nations. It became the religion of the Roman Empire. Christians may hope for a time when Asia and Africa may own allegiance to the Founder of their faith ; but the historian will not cherish the expectation that the people of these continents will ever become adherents of any European Church. To speak plainly, an universal Church is as much a chimæra as an universal empire. The double dream of an universal Roman Church and an universal Roman Empire floated before the minds of men in the Middle Ages ; but now that man knows his home from end to end, the Roman Empire seems a small thing, and the Latin Church a smaller. One who has been brought up under the magic of the Roman name, like Heiler, may ask, Why should Rome not be the capital of the world-religion ? Others will more reasonably ask, Why should it ?

For Latin Catholicism is an institution much narrower even than European Christianity. It is the religion of the Latin-speaking Mediterraneans, and of the barbarian invaders whom they were able to assimilate. What Heiler calls vulgar Catholicism is the ancestral religion of south-western Europe. It borrowed what it could understand of Greek philosophy ; it neglected and lost Greek science ; it thoroughly understood and eagerly developed the theory and practice of Roman Imperialism. 'Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento.' As long as northern Europe was under the tutelage of the more advanced nations of the south, it remained Catholic ; but there were many precursors of the Reformation in England and Germany, and the great cleavage of the 16th century so nearly followed racial lines that it bears the character of a Nordic secession. There is no likelihood whatever that the northern Europeans will ever return to the Italian allegiance. It is curious that Heiler does not seem to have considered the racial limits of Romanism, though history has marked them out very

clearly. He is obsessed by the ideal of one fold and one shepherd.

'The tragedy of Catholicism,' then, is not to be found in its failure to maintain the character of a *complexio oppositorum*, a combination of opposite tendencies, for this was never a part of the Catholic ideal. Nor is there any tragedy in its failure to establish a world-empire, for no such empire can ever exist. We shall find the tragedy rather in the political evolution of the Western Church, which Sabatier has described with much insight. Rome is to-day the only surviving autocracy, the one remaining example of a type of government which has had a notable past, and may have a future, but which for the present has been discredited and abandoned in all secular States. This unique position makes the Latin Church a very interesting object of study for the political philosopher, but the means by which this centralised despotism was acquired, consolidated, and perpetuated furnish grounds for an unanswerable indictment against those who claim any peculiar sanctity for the Catholic Church as an institution. It is the Church as a political organisation which has made so many enemies; and unhappily the will to power has infected every branch of the institution, determining doctrine no less than policy.

The Roman Empire, as is well known, became more centralised and more despotic until it fell to pieces. Both the Court and the system of government approached more nearly to the Asiatic type, chiefly because only a very strong central government could cope with the evils of praetorianism, which was wrecking civilisation by repeated pronunciamientos. The same tendency showed itself in the Church, though the problems of ecclesiastical government were different. As Sabatier says, 'after having been in apostolic times a pure democracy, the Church became a great federation governed by its bishops; this was an aristocratic regime. Then the primacy of Rome turned it into a monarchy, at first tempered by the Councils, afterwards more and more centralised, omnipotent, and finally absolute.' The same political necessity, he says, determined the whole evolution, which culminated in the dogma of infallibility. But we are tempted to ask whether this steady movement towards a complete autocracy was inevitable from

the first, or whether, quite early in Church history, there was a parting of the ways, when the alternative course might have been taken. I shall not attempt to decide this very difficult question, but a few considerations may be offered.

It is certain that the Gospel of Christ levels all institutional barriers, whether sacred or secular, by ignoring them. Faith and love are the only and sufficient passports to membership of the 'little flock.' But even within the circle of the Twelve instances are recorded of the characteristic Jewish intolerance, and the early Church narrated with satisfaction how St John fled from a public bath when the heretic Cerinthus entered it. Jewish fanaticism combined with Roman imperialism to create the idea of a Church world-wide *de iure*, which regarded all dissentients as rebels and traitors, to be justly subjected to persecution here and eternal torments hereafter. This intolerance was not Greek in origin, though it is significant that Plato, who sketched with marvellous foresight the forms which his philosophic Republic must assume, sanctioned coercive measures against atheists and others, and even provided for a 'Nocturnal Council,' terribly like the Inquisition. Plutarch tells us that Cleanthes the Stoic 'thought that the Greeks ought to prosecute Aristarchus for impiety, for moving the centre of the universe; because Aristarchus tried to account for the phenomena by the hypothesis that the firmament is stationary, and that the earth revolves round the sun in an oblique circle, at the same time rotating on its own axis.' But this precursor of Galileo was a Greek, and escaped the fate of the Renaissance astronomer.

We have to account for the instinctive fear of the Church which the imperial government soon began to manifest. The pagans despised the Christians as a 'tenebrosa et lucifugax natio,' but at the same time they considered them an association of a peculiarly dangerous kind. They were not so foolish as to suppose them to be social revolutionaries, though this has been suggested; but they saw in the Church an *imperium in imperio*, independent of the empire and ostentatiously indifferent to it. They feared that the triumph of the Church would mean the disappearance of the old civilisation, and that

'a shapeless darkness would destroy all the beauty of the world.' The effect of the persecutions was to foster a spirit which would have been easily exorcised by a different treatment. At Alexandria the adherents of different religions met in friendly intercourse and attended the same university lectures; a Christian philosophy soon sprang up which did not wish to deny its debt to the old culture. But in the Church as a whole authority was becoming more rigorous and more centralised; the Church was preparing for its final struggle for recognition and supremacy. The historian may think that what happened was inevitable. The effect certainly was that Roman imperialism received a new lease of life under the form which Celsus and Julian would have considered the least desirable.

The Concordat under Constantine pointed to the form of government called Caesaro-papism, in which the secular and sacred hierarchies support each other. This was in fact the Byzantine system; but the Eastern patriarchates, for various reasons, remained 'autocephalous'; there has never been an Eastern Pope. The jealousy of the Tsars even deprived the Russian patriarch of his power, which was put into commission under the Holy Synod. But the crumbling and collapse of the Western Empire left the Roman Church supreme, or only confronted by the embarrassed phantom of the Holy Roman Empire. It is interesting to observe how little the progress of the Papacy was retarded by the 'Pornocracy' and other scandals of the Middle Ages. The feudal idea played into the hands of the Pope. In a state of society where every one was some one else's 'man,' there must be one supreme head on earth of the Church.

The Renaissance seemed to promise a stable alliance between Christianity and humanism, which after bringing to perfection a glorious Catholic art, might at last have ended the conflict between orthodoxy and natural science. But Northern Europe, now becoming conscious of its right to political and spiritual independence, revolted against the Roman obedience, and the savage wars of religion followed. They ended in a permanent cleavage on racial lines, and Rome became distinctively the Church of the Latins. In the struggle with Protestantism some abuses were remedied; but Heiler

## 20 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

is right when he says that the whole character of the Roman Church was changed for the worse. Not only Protestantism but modern civilisation gradually became the enemy, till in 1864 a Papal Bull pronounced that, 'If any one says that the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself with progress, liberalism, and modern civilisation, let him be anathema'; and thirteen years later the same infallible authority condemned the theory of evolution as 'contradicted by history, by the tradition of all peoples, by exact science, by observed facts, and by reason itself; it is in truth not worth refutation.' It goes without saying that no Protestant Church would wish or dare to use such language, which seems to mark the Roman Church as a home of lost causes, a survivor of modes of thought which the civilised world has outgrown. But history has shown that the Papal hierarchy has never been deficient in astuteness and political wisdom. It is not, and seldom has been, interested in theological questions as such; its motives are purely political. And it stands committed, on political grounds, to this truceless war against all the ideas of the modern world. These declarations, let us remember, belong to the generation which put the coping-stone on the Papal autocracy.

The policy, apparently, is to regard all independent thinkers as already lost, and to bring the rest under a tighter discipline. The discipline, as is well known, is not strictly enforced upon the laity, who are practically invited to take what suits them in the Catholic system, and only to abstain from contradicting the rest. The officers, the priests, are to be bound to implicit obedience, even if they are ordered to swear that black is white. 'La chiesa non è un credo, la chiesa è una disciplina'; from the private soldiers loyalty only is exacted. It is true that the Canons say: 'Nec sufficit ut obedientia sit externa, sed etiam interna esse debet, neque contenta obsequioso silentio'; but this is an ideal, and practically means only that doubts must be crushed out like the suggestions of sensuality. This, and not any particular doctrines, is the real essence of Catholicism. As Mark Pattison said:

'Those rites and those doctrines which have made noise in the Roman controversy are those which are least of the essence of Romanism. The Virgin and the Saints, Reliques,

Images, Purgatory and Masses — these bywords with the vulgar and unthinking are powerless decorations or natural developments. The one essential principle of the Catholic system is the control of the individual conscience by an authority or law placed without it, and exercised over it by men assuming to act in the name of heaven.'

Autocracy and the claim of universal empire go together. It is necessary for the Roman Church to discredit completely all other forms of Christianity, denying any efficacy to their rites, and threatening all their members with eternal damnation, without respect to their moral characters. The only loophole by which a Protestant can hope for the mercy of God is by the plea of 'invincible ignorance.'

From the institutional and professional point of view, the Roman system has very obvious advantages, so long as the laity can be kept on the level of culture which is favourable to belief in magical or supernatural powers. In backward communities, where the strength of Catholicism lies, the priests still exercise considerable influence, which is not sensibly impaired by declarations of war against modern science. The one essential thing is that the hierarchy should not lose its control of primary education.

The rigid discipline of the Church is also a source of great political strength. Protestantism has no wish to influence the political action of citizens; there is no Protestant vote. Nor do the Protestant Churches, as a rule, attempt to intimidate the press, to work for their own ends through the jury system, or to control town councils. All these things the Roman Church does as a matter of course. It makes bitter enemies; but it can extort bargains from governments, suppress adverse comments in newspapers, injure opponents and help friends. It is significant that no one has yet exposed the wide-reaching influence which the Vatican used on the side of the Central Powers during the war.

Even more significant is the disposition to turn towards Rome, whenever a nation feels itself to be in danger of internal disruption. In France between 1871 and 1914 there was a revulsion against the 'ideas of 1789,' under which the country seemed to be disintegrating, and a disposition to look for national redemption to what was

## 22 CATHOLICISM AT THE CROSS-ROADS

sometimes called the hierarchical idea. This movement was especially represented by men of letters, several of whom rallied to Catholicism, more, it would seem, from patriotism than from real religious conviction. They believed that the Church was the only force which could consolidate the nation and check fissiparous tendencies. So Heiler quotes 'one of the most distinguished Liberal theologians in Germany' as saying, 'The Catholic Church is the only salvation for our poor fatherland.' The real strength of the Roman Church lies in its wonderful organisation. It is quite possible that if international revolutionary conspiracies become really menacing, European civilisation may find no other protector than 'the Black International,' round which all supporters of law and order may, in terror of a general upheaval, gather themselves. If this ever happens, the Church will once more have the support of the educated portion of society, and may even ally itself again with humanism and science, and so recover from the blunders of the last four centuries.

This, however, is not likely to happen except in the Latin countries. In England it is hardly conceivable. Our people are not prone to revolution, and are conspicuous for a sturdy independence which is the very antithesis of the Catholic spirit. Even before the Reformation the English were not contented subjects of a foreign Church, and to suppose that they will ever submit themselves to an Italian priest is the dream of a few bigoted ecclesiastics. Our national character, which is based upon a chivalric ideal—the code of a 'gentleman'—is very far removed from the qualities of the Latin races. Our weekday religion is a religion of honour, truthfulness, generosity, and fair play, and no rival ideal in which these qualities hold at best a very subordinate place, has any chance of being honoured and accepted by the English. Prof. Santayana, himself a Spaniard by descent, recognised very clearly the fundamental differences between the English and the Latin temperament, after spending two or three years in this country. 'If the Englishman likes to call himself a Catholic, it is a fad like a thousand others, to which his inner man, so seriously playful, is prone to lend itself. He may go over to Rome on a spiritual tour . . . but if he is converted

really and becomes a Catholic at heart, he is no longer the man he was. Words cannot measure the chasm which must henceforth separate him from everything at home. For a modern Englishman, with freedom and experiment and reserve in his blood, to go over to Rome is essential suicide; the inner man must succumb first. Such an Englishman might become a saint, but only by becoming a foreigner.'

No one supposes that Protestantism as we have known it in the 19th century has a great future, and it may well be that in the externals of worship there will be less difference between northern and southern Europe a hundred years hence than there is to-day. But each country must develop on its own lines, in religious no less than in secular institutions. The system of independent national churches, which to Heiler appears a scandal, is probably more hopeful than the idea of a single central authority or a world-wide ecclesiastical polity. Christ spoke of 'one flock,' not of 'one fold'; the Vulgate *unum ovile* lends itself to a theory of the Church which cannot claim divine authority. Mutual recognition between the Churches is possible and desirable; political amalgamation is neither possible nor desirable.

For some of us, the most valuable part of Latin Christianity, next to the gentle piety which it often shelters, is that theological or philosophical tradition against which the Modernists are in sharp revolt. It is not necessarily connected with the obsolete science and popular mythology which it has incorporated and which it endeavours to defend. The whole idea of the supernatural as a 'higher order' dovetailed into the natural order is extraneous to the philosophy on which Catholic theology rests. But much more alien to this philosophy is the anti-intellectualism of the last thirty years. This new metaphysic is trying to support itself by appealing to the new psychology, as we see in another remarkable German book of last year, Otto's 'Das Heilige.' But it is, in our opinion, irreconcilable with the Christian view of the world, which trusts human reason, and never supposes that we can make for ourselves the objects of our worship or the goal of our efforts. The God of Christianity is at once the *valor valorum* and the *ens realissimum*.

W. R. INGE.

## Art. 2.—THE BADGER AT HOME.

*The Badger, Afield and Underground.* By H. Mortimer Batten. Witherby, 1923.

OF the larger birds and beasts whose status in this country has improved within recent years, the badger's case is, perhaps, the most remarkable. Speaking for the West Country, at any rate, he is everywhere extending his range, and this season I have found his unmistakable work in many localities where he has never before been known to lie. 'He may yet win in the race of life with his more numerous and protected neighbour, the fox,' wrote the late Mr W. H. Hudson twenty years ago; and though the great naturalist could scarcely have anticipated the astonishing changes which have since taken place in the animal kingdom, it seems more than likely that his forecast will prove correct.

It is, after all, only true to life that this stolid, sturdy, friendless beast should hold his own under conditions which have proved too hard for so many of his more gifted fellow-creatures. One cannot but admire the badger, and the long, unequal fight for existence which he has maintained so well all down the centuries. There is something pre-eminently British about him, with his independence, courage, and very tenacity. And apart from any such sentiment he has yet another claim to consideration upon purely historical grounds, for, according to Prof. Owen, he is 'the oldest known species of mammal now living on the face of the earth.' Unfortunately, however, the average Englishman cares for none of these things, and it is well for the badger that he is no way dependent upon human protection.

Mr Mortimer Batten's volume on this ancient and interesting animal comes at an opportune time. The badger's cause is ably pleaded without any avowed intention on the part of the author other than to sketch its history. From the standpoint of an impartial observer the nature and habits of the subject are faithfully represented, though the direction in which the writer's sympathies lie is never in doubt. He is a keen supporter of the 'badger-clubs' now in existence; he very properly denounces 'baiting' and its accompanying practices, pointing out that there is one rule common

to all—a fair deal, and when possible a humane one. In this respect, as in many others, I am heartily with Mr Batten. Indeed, speaking from life-long experience, I endorse his opinions upon every important issue, though minor differences inevitably arise, for there is no cast-iron law in Natural History. To a large extent the book deals with the sturdy Highland badger, who sometimes continues to live and thrive with the ptarmigan upon the barren fare of the mountain-tops, far above the zone of the red grouse. Mr Batten's remarks upon the size attained by this hardy beast are not a little interesting. According to information acquired by him, a mountain badger may weigh as much as forty-five pounds, and this is not incredible, for it is a recognised fact that animals reared upon arid lands frequently outweigh their better nourished and more civilised relatives. It is not certain, however, that Mr Batten's theory to account for this circumstance quite meets the case.

In bygone days, as recorded in old parish registers, small bounties were paid by the community for the destruction of certain animals. One shilling was the price set upon a badger's life, and the sum represented a day's hard labour in those times. The West-Countryman of the 20th century needs no such incentive, however, and every sporting character in the countryside considers the 'grey' fair game. Few indeed can resist a go at him. Long ago in the old barbarian days I discovered some badgers established in a lonely wooded coombe over which I held the sporting rights, and desiring closer acquaintance with them, I took the liberty of setting some snares in their highways. Nothing happened for a few days, then one morning, when going the round soon after sunrise, I was not a little astonished to find one of the grey wayfarers tumbling about in a snare which certainly had not been set by me. It subsequently transpired that two or three local 'sports' had been surreptitiously trying to entrap these particular badgers, each unaware that anybody else was at the same game, and, most curious of all, the springe in which the grey was caught had been set by the highly respectable gamekeeper of a neighbouring estate. Neither he nor anybody apart from myself had the remotest right

to be there at all ; nor were the badgers doing anything to provoke attack. The men had somehow got wind of their whereabouts, and positively could not leave them alone. That was all.

The tendency is to represent the 'grey' as a clumsy, heavy-witted creature, whereas our friend the fox, justly famous for his fleetness of foot, is also reputed to be a past-master of subtlety and finesse. That the badger should have acquired this reputation is only natural, but it is scarcely fair to compare him with his more nimble fellow-woodsman, the structure and habits of the two animals being so widely different. One might as reasonably draw comparisons between an otter and a cat. It should be remembered, however, that the badger is usually seen at a disadvantage, being exhibited by day under conditions entirely foreign to his nature. While the fox is largely diurnal in his habits, the badger is wholly and exclusively a creature of the night. He is not even like the bats and the owls, who prefer twilight to total darkness. Black night, or the closest approach to it, he must have, and so remains in the gloom of his own burrow until long after the stars are bright. When compelled to show himself in the broad glare of noonday his movements look heavy and awkward simply because everything is strange to him.

The effect produced upon animals by any material change in the conditions to which they have been accustomed is far greater than most people imagine. A few years ago upon the southern slope of Haldon there grew an immense gorse-brake, beneath which the ground was literally honeycombed with rabbit-burrows. Rabbits abounded there, but so tangled was the wild growth that one could do nothing. In course of time, however, it became an imperative necessity to get rid of them ; so one morning we requisitioned a gang of labourers to clear away the age-old jungle of gorse and brier, and later in the day, when the task was completed and the hillside laid bare to the sunlight for the first time within memory of any one there, got to work with the ferrets. The burrows were shallow, we found ; rabbits were soon out, and their bewilderment upon discovering the change that had taken place was curious and even pitiable to see. They made little attempt to run from the guns, but

hopped stupidly about, looking for their vanished runways, and in many cases one could actually pick them up. It was an unforgettable sight—one of the strangest, indeed, that memory can recall out of all my sporting experiences.

Despite this reputation for stupidity, the badger is really marvellously keen-sensed, and wary to the last degree. The fox is easily trapped or poisoned, but endless patience and woodcraft of no mean order are required to circumvent a 'grey.' A gamekeeper once told me that when trapping for badgers he allows several days to elapse before visiting his gins. When I pointed out the cruelty of such a practice he pleaded necessity. A badger, he said, is so shy that a human foot-scent anywhere near his usual haunts will make him cautious for days, and the only way to ensure success is to keep clear until the animal's suspicions have been allayed.

Trappers adopt such methods too often. A fox was recently found dead in a gin on the edge of a furze-brake. It must have lain there many days, for it had torn up every mouthful of grass within reach and stripped the very bark off some branches which overhung the place. One trap is not considered strong enough to hold a badger, so two are set close together, the unfortunate animal, if caught in either of them, being pretty sure to tread upon the other in his struggles. Sometimes he sticks his foot into a gin intended for something else, but unless the stake happens to be firmly driven he soon wrenches it out and makes off, dragging the whole contrivance with him. Should the trapper find him, his fate is sealed, of course, and, generally speaking, it is better so. To release any animal from a gin is doubtful kindness; as often as not it dies from after effects, and, at best, suffers considerably. The only alternative goes sadly against the grain, however, and one is always tempted to give the poor creature the benefit of the doubt.

The harmfulness of the badger is an open question, depending mainly upon one's way of looking at such things. He is undeniably omnivorous, and if that outweighs the additional charm and interest which his presence imparts to the woodland there is nothing further to be said. It is of little use to argue these

points by economics. In any case no good sportsman will be guilty of vandalism, nor is the better type of outdoor man likely to forget that there are other considerations as important as the claims of sport.

He has, of course, many enemies and many accusers, and to assert that he *never* commits the crimes laid to his charge is dogmatic and unwise. As regards poultry-killing, for example, his guilt in given cases is unquestionable, it would seem. At the same time bare justice compels one to point out that such instances, however true, are exceptional, and usually the outcome of circumstances which do not come to light. If Nature-lovers sometimes appear a little stubborn or unduly incredulous it is because they know that an exception, once admitted, is too often treated as the rule. There are always people ready enough to accept any excuse for persecuting wild creatures, and in this respect keen fox-hunters are not always quite fair on the badger, I am afraid. When complaints are lodged against our special protégé some of us are a little too apt to cast the blame upon innocent shoulders. This saves the life of many a fox, but it is scarcely 'cricket.'

The badger's peculiar structure renders him unfit to be a hunter of living things; few creatures could conceivably become his victims; and as a rule his search is for vegetable rather than for animal food. No doubt he, too, experiences that unaccountable hankering for flesh which assails every vegetarian with dangerous force now and again, but normally he has a sweeter tooth, and it is such things as beech-nuts, wild fruits, and honey which appeal most to his ursine palate. A little bear indeed he is in all his tastes and main characteristics, despite the fact that modern scientists have classed him with the weasels. To be strictly accurate, he might well be a connecting link between the two families, but I must leave that point to the learned.

Like the brown bear he is something of a grubber, being particularly partial to insects in their immature state. Few wasps' nests escape him, and he is the Satan of every ant community upon his range. For a meat diet he depends largely upon young rabbits while still in their nesting burrows or 'stops,' so called because the entrance hole is usually stopped with mould by the

mother doe when leaving. These he unearths wholesale, digging straight down to them in his own peculiar and interesting way, thus rendering the agriculturist a signal service, albeit that singularly illogical individual only anathematises him for his pains.

Experts differ upon the question of his usefulness or otherwise in a hunting country; and here, again, so much depends upon circumstances that one hesitates to express a definite opinion. Where genuine doubt exists, however, it is a good rule to let Nature settle her own problems. Badgers, of course, mean open earths and endless stopping, but they also mean clean, healthy burrows and plenty of foxes above ground. Observation has dispelled my belief in the old theory that the fox ousts the 'grey' from his abode. It is very much the reverse, indeed, for rather is the badger apt to eject the would-be lodger with scant ceremony. An inexperienced huntsman sometimes wonders why upon occasions a hard-pressed fox does not avail himself of an open earth. If told the true reason he might not credit it.

Given a sporting chance, the badger is fair game, like anything else. Circumstances may render it advisable to destroy him, but there is neither occasion nor excuse for the cruelty which so often accompanies his capture. In this part of the world when a 'grey' is caught it is an all too prevalent custom to 'save him for another day,' which means that he is kept about for an indefinite period to be worried to death soon or late at his captor's pleasure. No decent-minded man has any use for this sort of thing, and it is the bounden duty of landowners who permit badger-digging to see to it that any animals taken are promptly and properly despatched.

A 'hunt' near Bude some years ago resulted in the capture of two fine greys which were eventually handed over to some men from the town, who wished to convey them home for the usual humane purpose. After a rollicking hour spent at the nearest bar the party, boarding a market-cart in jolly-good-fellow style, started upon the return journey with the sack containing the badgers stuffed under the seat. None of the three men which composed the party was exactly sober, but, their horse being of the stolid sort, they got along without mishap, and were bowling merrily down one of the long

hills of the country when, without the slightest warning, the driver felt his leg seized from behind by sharp teeth. With a howl of consternation and terror he sprang up, relinquished the reins, and losing his balance rolled like a sack on to the road. His companions, meanwhile, realising that the badgers by some strange mischance were loose amongst their unprotected legs, scrambled headlong over the tail-board, and the lightened vehicle with its unusual passengers trundled away behind the now thoroughly startled horse. As usually happens in such cases, nobody was seriously hurt, and when the trio had sufficiently recovered to follow the cart, they found it overturned at the foot of the hill, the badgers, as might be supposed, being conspicuous by their absence.

A badger's work, whether at home or afield, is easily distinguishable from that of a fox. Being the stronger animal, he scatters the earth more widely, tearing up the turf in large fragments, which he throws back to a considerable distance. Fox-mould, on the other hand, is always fine, almost as if it had been sifted. A badger's spoor, too, is unmistakable. Bear-like again, he treads heavily and upon the whole of the heel, leaving a curiously elongated imprint, with claw-marks deeply impressed at the one end. A fox, unless treading upon particularly soft ground, steps so mincingly that he leaves only the slight impression of his claws, showing little more than pinpricks; his tracks are few, lying some eighteen inches apart, and in a perfectly straight line, except when he is galloping, in which case the fore-pads fall slightly apart, hare fashion. Excepting these peculiarities there is little difference between a fox's footprints and those of a light-stepping terrier dog.

The badger digs his earth in any locality where he can find suitable conditions. Solitude is a *sine qua non*, and whenever possible he selects some wooded slope, warmed by the sun. Everything depends upon the soil, however; if need be he burrows just as readily upon the bleakest ridge, and more than once I have found him established in a lonely cairn on the very summit of a mountain-top. One need only observe his dug-out, and the immense earth-works which too clearly betray his whereabouts, to form a tolerable idea of his enormous strength and tireless energy. A holt which I recently

examined in a precipitous Devonshire coombe consisted of nine huge holes, wide apart, leading as it seemed into the very heart of the hill, with an incredible accumulation of sand and flint heaped outside every entrance. It required both hands to lift some of these stones, and a man would have had hard work to get them out with a pickaxe. Yet the badgers had done it, unaided by other tools than their own strong claws.

Entrenched in these great strongholds the grey is practically unassailable. On the crest of a pine ridge near my old home in West Dorset there is an earth so deep that even a terrier cannot be heard when working its inmost recesses. No man living knows when it was first 'drawn out.' The wind-blown pines growing around it are hoary with age, being themselves, no doubt, relics of older and far wilder growth, and one may reasonably suppose that badgers were burrowing there when the surrounding country was a pathless forest wherein the wolf and the wild-cat prowled. The forest has gone long since, and with it many of the shy folk who loved its solitude, but the badgers, wildest and shyest of all, are there to-day, treading their still secluded ways, living their strange hidden lives in a land of man-made plenty, as their kind lived long centuries ago when the worst enemy to be feared was the Saxon hunter with his crude contrivances.

Near these historic settes I once saw three full-grown badgers, hoary and huge in the grey dawn, shambling homewards with a comically purposeful air, like boys going late to school. And 'years agone,' as the country people say, the same earth was the scene of a somewhat humorous attempt upon the life or liberty of a wily old boar who had triumphed over more than one deep-laid scheme for his overthrow.

Choosing a dark mild night when the grey patriarch was safe to be peregrinating afield, a party of sporting rustics, as the story goes, stalked round by obscure ways to the holt, and with faggots previously cut for the purpose, stopped every hole save two or three, into which they stuffed capacious sacks, mouths outermost, pegging each in such a way that it fitted the passage perfectly. This done, they betook themselves to sundry trees in the vicinity and awaited developments. As the

night waned a fresh wind, springing up from the right quarter, still furthered their chances, and about sunrise the old badger was seen returning, shuffling along heedlessly enough, without a suspicion of danger. When about a gunshot from home he got wind of the enemy, paused uncertainly, and might have turned tail had not one of the men perceived the situation and announced himself with a yell. The scare was sufficient. Panic-stricken now, he made a blind rush for the nearest hole, and dived headlong into a sack only too skilfully prepared to receive him. The conspirators rushed to the place, wild with triumph, which soon enough gave place to howls of disappointment. The bottom of the sack was insecurely stitched, and the badger, using his iron front to some purpose, had gone clean through it.

In sandy soil a badger is more than a match for tools and terriers. He is also remarkably adept at 'burying himself,' which means that he blocks the hole with earth and so baffles the diggers by leaving them no clue to follow. This is not, I think, done with intent. The soil which chokes the passage is only that loosened and thrown back by the animal as he digs his way further in from the din of the pickaxes. A dog when tunnelling after a rabbit is liable to do the same thing, and cannot always extricate himself. The badger's gain, indeed, is doubtful, for I am not one of those who believe that he can live long without air. If stopped in too deeply he dies like anything else from suffocation, although he certainly scores over other creatures in being able to dig his way out with greater facility.

He bores readily through hard chalk upon which iron makes little impression, and the only substance which appears to baffle him is clay, in which respect he is one with every burrowing animal from man downwards. No holes run deep in clay-lands, and that is why the badger is so easily taken in many parts of Devonshire where clay largely predominates.

During midsummer and early autumn, the ripeness of the year, when nuts and wild fruits abound, he is a restless wanderer. Then he lies about anywhere in big rabbit-burrows, dry drains or hovers, and occasionally above ground in some gloomy evergreen tangle. Crisp, brilliant nights, when the harvest moon is full, find him

far afield, grubbing about the oak and beech woods, wandering freely over cultivated lands and through the standing corn. He is partial to ripe grain, and young rabbits, too, tempt him on to the fields. During his irresponsible springtime rambles both he and his newly-selected mate are somewhat too fond of rolling in the fresh green wheat, and this is, I think, the only real cause of complaint that the agriculturist has against him.

As autumn wanes he puts on flesh rapidly, in preparation for his long sleep, selects some warm dry holt, and begins to gather material for his bed. For this purpose he principally uses dry moss, uprooted and turned over by himself when grub-hunting earlier in the year, and any such material littered about an earth, is another fairly certain sign by which the occupier may be identified. As nights grow cold and his snug nest becomes more inviting, he stirs abroad less, and soon or late, according to the season, settles down to sleep the winter away.

Some mild February evening he crawls forth, ravenous from his long fast, and, during the weeks which immediately follow, one sees most signs of his activities in the warren. Now, too, he draws out his burrow, repairs the havoc wrought by winter floods, moles and rabbits, after which his 'fancy turns to thoughts of love.' Badgers pair soon after they unberth, and the young, numbering three or four, are born about the same time as fox-cubs, or rather earlier as a rule. The great mainearths are their breeding-places, more than one family being sometimes found in the same locality, from which we may assume that the sow badger, unlike the vixen, has no cause to fear cannibals of her own race.

When big enough to run the cubs accompany their mother to the feeding grounds. One moonlight night I had been out late in the woods, watching for wild roe-deer, and was returning by way of a marshy glade when I heard a confused murmur of sounds which seemed to proceed from some reeds on the farther side of a little hollow not twenty yards away from me. One could not call them grunts. They were softened out of all recognition, and I was completely puzzled to account for them until an old sow badger suddenly lurched into view, and began nozzleing about amongst the coarse dewy roots of the cotton-grass.

Before I could efface myself she caught sight of me, stared hard for a moment, then sat erect on her haunches, crossed her fore-paws over her nose, and so surveyed me intently. She was evidently puzzled, being unaccustomed to encounter human beings at so late an hour, and while she hesitated whether to retreat or proceed on her way, four little grey-brown forms no bigger than half-grown rabbits filed out from the reeds, ranged up alongside their mother, and copying her attitude exactly, they too sat erect and solemnly studied the phenomenon. And so for a long minute they sat in the unclouded moonlight, a unique picture of quaint, old-world animal life. Then, with a sudden snort, the grey mother spun round and scuttled away, whisking her 'shortun' like a startled deer, with the cubs close at her heels, tumbling over one another in precipitate flight.

Ahead the reed-growth was thick; into this the little procession plunged like a long grey snake, and, once out of sight, all sound ceased as though a door had closed upon them. The glade narrowed here, and tall larches trooping down to the edge of the swamp cast deep shadow over the place; but with dry brackeny banks on either side, and the bed of the little coombe beyond thick with crackling grasses, it seemed impossible that even a rabbit could escape unheard. Thinking they must be squatting somewhere near I advanced cautiously into the cover, all agog for the expected bump and scramble. But nothing was there; no sound save my own guarded footfall; no movement other than wind-ripples over the sedges. The badgers had vanished mysteriously and completely, without as much as the patter of hard little feet on the leaves or the rush of furred bodies through the crisp grass.

Given time and ordinary patience, it is not difficult to shoot a badger. One need only lie in wait at his settes. Dawn is always a likely time to see him, and during midsummer afternoons when it is hot and stifling underground it repays one well to watch near big holts, as young badgers, who suffer severely from thirst, often come out for water between four and five o'clock. A keeper in the employ of the late Sir John Kennaway once shot six well-grown cubs within an hour, all coming down to drink from a woodland stream at the

foot of a sand-bank. In spring or autumn a moonlight night may serve as well, but the badger is a late riser, and one may wait long and see nothing. When earth-stopping for night-hunting, it was little use as a rule to get to work until a good hour after dark. If done earlier we seldom found any animals out.

Above all things, the direction of the wind must be taken into account when choosing one's position. A badger's eyes are dull, but his long sensitive nose is the keenest that sifts the night, and the faintest suspicion of an alien presence is enough for him. It is a good plan to climb a tree, if possible, for there one's scent is carried away by the breeze. Unless provided with a rifle it is not desirable to attempt a long shot, nor should one use very large pellets. No. 4 size will be found big enough. A larger load is less accurate, being too liable to scatter and wound rather than kill.

Badger-hunting with hounds at night is not bad fun. Riding is impossible, of course, nor can one actually see much; but it is real sport, and the music—the indescribable crash and cry of hounds running through the still, dark woods—is something to be remembered. It is a practically unheard-of sport, nowadays. I have known of but two packs in my time, both of which have vanished long since. They were recruited from draft hounds of every description, and disbanded at the end of each season. Long runs there were none, and the grey was soon overhauled unless he could find refuge of any sort, but for all that, it was even-chanced enough. As often as not the hounds declined to tackle their formidable quarry when actually overtaken, and after a running interchange of pleasantries which continued sometimes for a mile or more, he would eventually beat them by getting to ground, the stopping being of a most perfunctory nature.

The badger, for his size, must be the most powerful animal in the world. His structure is particularly adapted for defence, the highly vulnerable under parts being shielded by his peculiarly low and crouching action. Excepting deer, he is the largest wild animal still existing in Great Britain, ranging in weight from twenty-five to thirty-five pounds, according to locality. Though wildest of living things he is also the bravest

and when cornered in a hole beyond hope of escape, he walks boldly out to meet his doom, if permitted to do so. He is resolute in all things, and having once made up his mind to go in any particular direction, it is nearly impossible to turn him from his purpose.

One of the two peculiarities which he shares with the weasels is his extreme sensibility to a blow across the bridge of the nose. This, if properly delivered, will cause instant death, but some anatomical knowledge is necessary to despatch him thus, lacking which, an amateur is apt to make a terrible mess of it. Once—a memory which still causes a shudder—I saw a badger receive several smashing blows from a crowbar with no visible effect whatsoever. On this occasion the blows were delivered too near the skull. The right spot found, violence is unnecessary. Here is an instance: It occurred while earth-stopping prior to hunting, when badgers, realising the situation, at times make determined efforts to get to ground while the work is actually in progress. On this occasion a young boar suddenly burst into the circle of light shed by the lanterns, and ran boldly from hole to hole, bent upon gaining the bosom of Mother Earth while yet he might. He cared nothing for shouts; clods and stones were alike ignored; he might, indeed, have been alone in the woods for all the notice he took of anybody. At last he espied an open hole, for which he made, indifferent to the fact that a man bestrode it. The man, after vainly endeavouring to turn him by other means, struck at his face with a stick which happened to be handy. It was a mere rap, one might say, but to the astonishment of all concerned poor Badger turned two or three complete somersaults, then straightened out upon his very doorstep, stone dead.

How long a badger may live in the wild state if let alone is a difficult point to decide. Some naturalists allot him fifteen years, but it is doubtful whether many attain to anything approaching such longevity. Left to Nature, his decline is easy, his passing imperceptible. As old age creeps on, his periods of activity gradually lessen. He sleeps the greater part of his time, retiring earlier and emerging later every succeeding season, until at last there dawns a spring when the call of the awakening world fails to arouse him.

DOUGLAS GORDON.

## Art. 3.—HOUSING.

THE question of Housing, or more accurately of the Housing of the Working Classes, is a very old one in British politics. For at least eighty years it has figured in Parliamentary debates. It has been the subject of a great deal of legislation. It has frequently occupied the attention of Royal Commissions and other forms of inquiry. It has often been a burning question at elections. It affects very closely the duties and actions of local authorities throughout the country. It has gone through many phases, and the housing problem of which we speak to-day is in many respects quite a different one from that which existed before the War, or rather before the year 1910. Up to that date the chief problem was how to get rid of slums, of insanitary areas, which unfortunately existed in most of our towns and cities and in a smaller degree in many country districts. This problem is still with us, but is overshadowed by the acute house shortage with which we have been confronted in recent years. The provision of new houses in sufficient numbers to keep pace with the requirements of our people is more important at the moment than the clearance of slums, important as that is. Slum clearance, which necessarily involves demolition, is obviously handicapped and impeded by the fact that there are not enough existing houses, good, bad, or indifferent, to go round, and that the supply has not been keeping pace with the annual demand.

Up to the middle of the last century the State did not actively concern itself in the housing question. The provision of houses was a matter entirely for private enterprise, which was allowed to build where it would, and as it would, without restriction or regulation. There was, indeed, a complete indifference to questions of public health. This was undoubtedly the cause of many of those terrible epidemics which ravaged the country in years gone by, such as the Plague of London in the reign of Charles II. For the same reason there was at all times an immense amount of preventable illness and mortality, and the average death rate was infinitely higher than it is to-day. So long, however, as the country was sparsely inhabited and the rate of increase

of the population was slow, the results of this were small and not ordinarily apparent. With the tremendous expansion of industry brought about by the use of steam power and the wonderful new inventions which followed the termination of the Napoleonic Wars, the whole aspect of the question changed. There was a vast increase of population, and the people had to be housed in close proximity to the mills, factories, and mines, which were being established all over what we now call the industrial districts. House builders set to work in our great towns to provide for this need, and in the absence of building regulations they put up as many houses to the acre as they could possibly cram in, with narrow roads and in many cases no roads at all, the houses being situated in small stuffy courts approached through archways, so that neither sunshine nor fresh air, God's greatest gifts to man, could penetrate. In many cases the houses were built back to back, which rendered through ventilation impossible. This is the origin of our slums or insanitary areas, plague-spots physically and morally, which are a disgrace to civilisation. Private enterprise, it is often said (especially by Socialist orators anxious to push their nationalisation or municipalisation nostrums), gave them to us; but it was unrestricted and unregulated private enterprise. They cannot be created anywhere in this country now. Building Acts and bye-laws have long rendered it impossible. Because private enterprise left uncontrolled in the past gave us slums, it does not follow that we should abandon it now. If we do we shall probably get neither slums nor houses of any sort in the future, except at a cost which will ruin the State and in a manner which will pauperise the whole nation.

The first person to call prominent attention to the need of proper housing accommodation was Dr Southwood Smith, whose strenuous efforts led to the passing of the Public Health Act in 1848. His grand-daughter, Miss Octavia Hill, carried on his work, and was the originator of the movement for improved industrial dwellings, in which others, such as George Peabody, the great American philanthropist, and Lord Rowton took a prominent part. The plans she adopted were based on the principle of teaching people to help themselves by inculcating in them proper notions of cleanliness,

order, and self-respect. Her efforts were crowned with singular success, and thousands of people have been housed in decent homes and helped to lead more comfortable and better lives. To the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury belongs the credit of having passed the first Housing Act in 1851, a small measure dealing with common lodging-houses. He was followed by Mr W. T. M. Torrens, who, in 1868 and 1879, in both of which years a Conservative Government headed by Mr Disraeli was in power, was responsible for Acts enabling individual insanitary houses to be dealt with; while in 1875 and 1879 Lord Cross, the Conservative Home Secretary, carried through the measures which first gave to local authorities powers to deal with insanitary areas by means of clearance schemes. Mr Disraeli had indeed long before, in his well-known book '*Sybil*', called attention to the 'condition of the people,' as he described it, and had urged the necessity of what is now termed 'Social Reform.' His ideas had been scoffed at by the philosophical Radicals of the Manchester School as a 'policy of sewage,' and it was not till over thirty years after the publication of '*Sybil*' that he obtained a majority which enabled him to carry these ideas into practice. He was the first British Prime Minister to bring forward a housing policy, and may in some ways be regarded as its author. His policy was carried further by his successor, Lord Salisbury, whose Government was responsible for the great consolidating and amending Act of 1890, Part I of which dealt with the subject-matter of Cross's Acts, namely, large insanitary areas; Part II with small groups or even single houses which had been previously dealt with by Torrens's Acts; while Part III extended the power of local authorities to build themselves and so to provide new accommodation, which had first been conferred on them by one of Lord Shaftesbury's Acts.

How serious were the evils with which Parliament had to deal may be learnt from some of the evidence given by Lord Shaftesbury before the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes in 1884. This Commission was notable from the fact that the late King Edward VII, then Prince of Wales, whose deep interest in questions of social welfare is well known, was

a member of it. Lord Shaftesbury, describing his early investigations into the subject, mentioned cases where fire engines had to be used to destroy vermin ; where a house was built over a sewer and there was a hole in the floor through which sewer rats, twenty at a time, made their way into the lower room ; of a cellar, inhabited by a woman and two children, through which all the filth of the house above flowed in an open wooden tube into the sewer ; of a room, inhabited by a woman and three children, the floor of which was less than a foot above an open cess-pool ; and of houses in Bermondsey built upon piles over a swamp into which all the filth was cast and from which water for washing and drinking was drawn !

The continuance of such horrors as these has long been rendered impossible by the operation of the Public Health Act, which was greatly strengthened and extended by Disraeli's Government in 1875 and has been further amended since. Similarly, the London Building Acts, and Building bye-laws all over the country, have rendered impossible the creation of new insanitary areas. In point of fact we passed from a condition of no regulation to the opposite extreme of too much regulation. We became positively bye-law ridden, and the cost and difficulty of building was greatly increased by perfectly unnecessary bye-laws, restricting unduly the choice of materials, compelling broad macadamised streets when a narrow carriage-way lined with strips of grass and trees would have been not only much cheaper but far less unsightly, and imposing the same conditions on country cottages, where light and air abound, as on town dwellings. It is rather remarkable that it has proved to be almost as difficult in recent years to get rid of unnecessary and vexatious restrictions as it was to obtain any kind of proper control in earlier days.

Turning to the action taken by Local Authorities in clearing slums under Cross's Acts as subsequently amended, a great deal has been accomplished in many of our great towns. In London the Metropolitan Board of Works and their successors, the London County Council, had completed altogether before the War thirty-one schemes, involving the clearance of 93 acres, the displacement of 43,844 persons, and a net cost to the rate-

payers of 2,185,000*l.* Of these the largest single scheme was that of Boundary Street, Bethnal Green, which comprised nearly 15 acres of the most appalling slums with a population of 5719. During the same period new accommodation was provided for 44,623 persons, mostly on the sites of the old houses by means of the creation of block dwellings under the 'Rehousing' requirements of the Acts. 'Rehousing' is, however, a misnomer, since, owing to the much higher rents which had to be charged for the new dwellings, very few of the persons displaced availed themselves of them, but found homes in cheaper vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood, which, however, it was believed led to a general levelling up of housing conditions. In the case of Boundary Street, it was estimated that only 3 per cent. of the original population returned to the old site. Moreover, it must not be supposed that the slum dweller invariably dislikes his slum. On the contrary, many of these poor people, who have never known anything better, love them; they are their homes and they do not want to be displaced. The writer of this paper remembers that when he was Chairman of the Housing Committee of the L.C.C. and the Tabard Street clearance scheme was in contemplation, he and his Committee were received almost with fury by some of the inhabitants when they were visiting the area, who strongly objected to any interference with their homes.

The great Tabard Street scheme was left unfinished when the War broke out, and is being completed now. It includes two other smaller areas, Grotto Place and Crosby Row, the total acreage amounting to over 16 acres. This scheme supplies a good example of the danger to public health caused by the existence of these insanitary areas. In the year 1910, when it was originally brought forward, the death rate for the whole of London was 14·9 per thousand, and for Southwark, in which the area was mainly situated, 18·2. In the Tabard Street area it was 36·8 and in Grotto Place 39·1. Turning to phthisis, the most common product of slum conditions, the average death rate for London was 1·38, for Southwark 1·98, for Tabard Street 3·88, and for Grotto Place no less than 6·10. It is interesting to record that taking London as a whole, the death rate in the

slum areas which have been cleared averaged 40 per thousand, while in the model dwellings which had been erected on the sites it averages 12 per thousand only.

As regards other great cities, Birmingham cleared an immense area of no less than 45 acres north and east of New Street in the 'eighties under Cross's Act, the whole area dealt with comprising altogether 93 acres; but in some parts of it the existing houses were not actually demolished but were patched up, obstructive buildings being removed, etc. Since then the Corporation have relied chiefly on the 'patching-up' policy, using their powers under Part II of the Housing Act of 1890. It is plain that this policy obviates the expense, delays, and cumbrous machinery of Part I, and certainly many insanitary districts have been greatly improved, confined courts having been thrown open, and back-to-back houses demolished; but it cannot be said that the result is as satisfactory as where complete clearances have taken place. Liverpool showed exceptional activity, clearing large districts near the docks, and by erecting exceedingly cheap tenement dwellings, which it was possible to do before the War, succeeded in rehousing on the sites considerably more than half the persons dispossessed, which was never found possible in London. Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, Brighton, and Plymouth are other notable examples of towns which undertook big clearance schemes before the War.

The War, of course, put an end to this activity, and the house shortage which has existed since has made its resumption very difficult. Much, however, remains to be done. To take the case of London, the L.C.C. have given very careful consideration to a report made in 1911 by the late Sir Shirley Murphy (then Medical Officer of Health), in which he had marked down no less than 1900 groups of three or more houses in London which were either congested or insanitary. A selection of twenty-two of the largest areas most urgently requiring remedying has been made, and six of them are being proceeded with at once, the Brady Street scheme in Bethnal Green being well advanced. In addition to this, sixteen schemes in various parts of the country have been confirmed by the Ministry of Health, and thirty-six local authorities have either submitted schemes

or have them under consideration. The duty of the community to put an end to these horrible slum conditions is becoming more and more recognised.

In this connexion two observations may be made. In the first place, whatever may be thought of the wisdom or unwisdom of local authorities undertaking the provision of new accommodation in competition with private enterprise, it is certain that only local authorities armed with compulsory powers can clear slums. There are endless interests involved in every insanitary area, lessees and sub-lessees, etc., innumerable, and the ground landlord has in most cases parted with all control over his property. These interests have to be extinguished by compulsion before any clearance can be effected. In one known instance a ground landlord arranged with the L.C.C. to declare an area on his property insanitary, as it undoubtedly was, and to use their compulsory powers, he bearing the entire cost of the clearance scheme. This was the Nightingale Street Scheme on the Portman Estate.

The other observation is that it has long been my opinion that, having regard to the national importance of removing slums, and the heavy cost which clearances always involve, the State ought to make a contribution towards the expense of the schemes, instead of allowing the whole of it to fall on the local ratepayers. This was proposed as long ago as 1912 in the Housing bill brought forward in that year, and in 1913 and 1914, by members of the Unionist Social Reform Committee, which, however, was rejected by the Liberal Government of the day. In 1919 Dr Addison adopted this principle, and by the Housing and Town Planning Act of that year the State undertook to pay the entire net cost of housing operations, including slum clearances, over and above the proceeds of a 1d. rate. The effect of this, however, was to impose an enormous and unlimited liability on the State, and the present plan, which will be carried out by the provisions of the new Bill now before Parliament, is that the State should make a contribution not exceeding one half of the net cost.

It may be asked why these schemes involved so much cost. The answer is that excessive compensation used to be paid to slum owners. The local authority had to

purchase the land and buildings and to pay for the site the whole market value, i.e. what it would fetch if it could be put to the most profitable use after it was cleared. Many insanitary areas are situated in the centre of towns where the commercial value of the land is great; but most of it cannot be used for commercial purposes but only for rehousing in accordance with the terms of the Act, and the difference between the market value and the housing value represented a heavy loss to the ratepayers. This is all changed now, and by the terms of the Act of 1919 the owners receive no compensation for the buildings, but only for the value of the cleared site, which is reduced to housing value in the case of that part of it used for rehousing. It is a question, indeed, whether these terms are not too hard on the owners, since there are cases where the houses themselves are in good condition, and the only fault is that owing to the original bad planning they are situated in a congested area. It is feared that some local authorities may refuse to act in order to avoid employing so hard a code. On the other hand, there is likely to be a great inducement to owners to put their property in good order so as to escape being expropriated on such terms. The result in any case will be that so far from losing money by the acquisition of slum property local authorities may even make a profit. If, however, this source of loss has disappeared, a new source has arisen in the shape of the excessive cost of building. The rehousing, after the land had been written down to housing value, used to pay its way. This is no longer possible, and will not be possible until building costs are substantially reduced. It is anticipated that this loss on rehousing will be greater than the saving effected on the cost of acquisition, the L.C.C. estimating it at not less than 75*l.* per person displaced. It is clear that under such conditions local authorities cannot be expected to undertake clearance schemes without State aid.

There is one further point which is of great importance. Miss Octavia Hill was undoubtedly right in insisting that the poor slum dwellers must be taught cleanliness and decency of living and to appreciate better housing conditions. There are, unhappily, people

who would make slums of any dwellings, simply in consequence of their inability to understand anything better than the horrible conditions under which they had been brought up. This of course is a matter which goes far beyond Parliamentary enactment or the activities of local authorities, which at the most can only lay down the conditions under which improvement is possible. It must be effected by education and by awaking a greater sense of physical and moral well-being among the people generally.

As has been stated, however, the most acute housing question at the moment is not slum clearance but the shortage of houses. This shortage is a new phenomenon, having been unknown before 1910. Indeed, up to that year many towns, especially London, were periodically overbuilt. The Census returns show that in England and Wales there were 448,932 empty houses in 1901. As late as 1911 there were 408,652. In 1909, however, the land clauses of the celebrated 'People's Budget' dealt a blow at the housing of the people from which it has never recovered. It must be remembered that at least 97 per cent. of the houses built up to that time had been provided by private enterprise, the small balance of about 3 per cent. being the contribution of local authorities. The smallest type of houses were usually erected by speculative builders, men who had in many cases been foremen to large contractors, and, having saved a little money, started on their own. In the first place, they probably built one or two cottages; they worked themselves with the few men they employed, or in some cases they and their sons did the whole work. They were usually financed locally, in many cases by solicitors, on easy terms, since they were producing an article readily saleable. Having completed their first house or pair of houses they sold them, turned their money over, and proceeded to build more. In this way were the great majority of workmen's houses erected, the fact that there existed a public always willing to invest in this class of property being the essence of the whole business. This investing public consisted largely of local tradesmen, who liked to put their savings into something which was both safe and visible. The People's Budget scared off this class of investor, who did not know where

he stood or how he was going to be taxed. Consequently, so far as house property was concerned, he buttoned up his pockets and has not unbuttoned them yet. As a result the small speculative builder ceased to provide workmen's dwellings.

The returns of the Inland Revenue of the numbers of houses exempt from Inhabited House duty (i.e. the smaller houses) show conclusively the disastrous effects of the Budget of 1909-10. The net increase in these houses was 90,165 in the year 1900, and from that year to 1909 inclusive, it only twice fell below 70,000, the average being 76,000. In 1910, the year after the introduction of the Budget, it was down to 5813! There was some recovery and a good deal of fluctuation after this, but the average for the years 1911, 12, 13, and 14 was only 50,000. The great incentive to house building had been destroyed.

Following this came the War, which brought house building to a standstill. The result was a real house famine after the Armistice, such as had never been experienced before. What the actual dimensions of the shortage were, nobody can say with accuracy. It has been variously put down as from 500,000 to 800,000 houses. Both estimates are probably very excessive, since it must be remembered that if house building had ceased the empties had been occupied. There are practically no empty houses now, except the country seats and the West End mansions of the new poor, which their owners, taxed almost out of existence, can no longer afford to occupy. The former appear likely to be turned rapidly into schools and other institutions; while the latter are being converted into flats.

It was chiefly to meet this house shortage that the Addison Act was passed. The building trade was disorganised and had been greatly weakened by the War, and with the demand for new factories and workshops and the vast arrears of repairs to be made good, it seemed very improbable that it would undertake the erection of working-class dwellings, which in view of the increased cost were certain to be unremunerative. It was decided, therefore, that the State should step in and do the work itself. The plan adopted was unfortunate. It was not foreseen that if the Government

undertook and pressed on a great building scheme all over the country the cost of building was bound to rise, as it did to an inordinate extent—cottages which were built for between 200*l.* and 300*l.* before the War costing as much as 888*l.* in some cases in 1920. This figure is exclusive of cost of land and development, and it is estimated that the average all-in cost of houses built under the Addison scheme was 1090*l.* Socialist orators are never tired of proclaiming that this was the result of building rings, and profiteering by capitalists, forgetting that among the greatest profiteers were the building operatives, whose Unions pushed up wages, limited the number of bricks which could be laid, and refused to allow their ranks to be recruited even from ex-Service men. The scheme, too, was badly conceived in the fact that the liability which fell on the local authorities through whom the State acted, was limited to the proceeds of a 1*d.* rate, whereas the State liability was unlimited; the result being that when the 176,000 houses, at which figure Sir Alfred Mond wisely stopped it, are all completed, the taxpayer will be burdened with nine and a half millions a year for sixty years. This is an appalling result financially, and from the housing point of view it is doubtful whether the house shortage has been reduced at all, since 176,000 probably represents just about the necessary annual increment of three years. To the 176,000 must indeed be added some 40,000 built by private builders with direct capital grants, which cost the country nine millions; but many of these, and indeed of the 176,000, cannot be strictly regarded as workmen's dwellings at all. Both in accommodation and in rents, though the latter are far from economic, they are really houses for the lower middle classes.

When the present Government came into office last October, the Addison scheme had been stopped by Sir Alfred Mond as has been stated; but the house shortage remained, and local authorities who still had long lists of applicants were clamouring for fresh subsidies. A few, indeed, had started building on their own account without subsidies, and were greatly helped by the fact that with the stoppage of the Government scheme the cost had shown a great reduction. In addition to this, it

was clear that so far as better-class houses of the villa type were concerned, or even of the superior working-class type, private enterprise was beginning to come back, and many people held, and still hold, the view, that, left to itself, it would have come back sufficiently to solve the whole question. Against this, however, was the undoubted fact that there was no immediate chance of its providing unassisted the smallest type of house, the house in which the average working-class family lives, and which could be let at a rent of from 7s. to 10s. a week. The builders stated that on such a house there would be a clear loss of 150*l.*, and even if this be an exaggeration, the loss would certainly not be less than 100*l.*

The whole matter was complicated by the existence of the Rent Restriction Act which was due to expire in June, but which, by universal consent, would have to be extended in some form or other for a further period. Rent restriction is, of course, a gross interference with private enterprise, and even though the Act does not apply to new houses, its existence, with the possibility of its extension to all houses, militates against building. It was no doubt a necessity during the shortage created by the War, and will remain a necessity while the shortage remains, since without suggesting that owners have a double dose of original sin, it is clear that rents would have been rushed up to impossible figures when the demand for houses greatly exceeded the supply. The trouble is that in the matter of rent restriction we have got into a vicious circle. We cannot get rid of rent restriction until we have a sufficiency of houses, and a supply of sufficient houses is impeded by the existence of rent restriction. How is the knot to be cut?

Here we come to the parting of the ways. It cannot be too strongly insisted that there are two possible policies, but only two. The first may be described as the Socialist policy. It is to make the provision of houses a State affair, the Government acting through the local authorities, who will build all the houses of less than a certain annual value which are required with State aid, and as they will always build much more expensively than private enterprise the rents charged will be uneconomic. In other words, just as we have free education

we shall also have partially free housing. Meanwhile, the restriction of rents on houses privately owned will be rendered permanent. It is an appalling prospect, and will cost the taxpayers and the ratepayers immense sums per annum, but it is undoubtedly the plan deliberately favoured by the Socialist Labour Party.

The other policy is to endeavour to bring back private enterprise, and to remove rent restriction as soon as sufficient houses have been erected. The source which supplied 97 per cent. of the houses before the 1909-10 Budget should be encouraged to resume its activities, and municipal house building should merely supplement deficiencies where they exist, as was originally intended by Parliament. Fortunately, the land clauses of the People's Budget have been repealed.

The best way of doing this would undoubtedly be to subsidise private enterprise temporarily in the building of the type of house which cannot be built at present without State assistance, on account of the loss involved, i.e. the smallest type of house. This could be done in two ways, either by capital payments to builders for each house of the prescribed size, and on an agreed site of, say, 100*l.*, or else by a remission or partial remission of the rates on such houses, which remission would attach to the houses for a period of years and make them easily saleable at remunerative prices. This latter plan has been adopted by the States of New York and New Jersey in America, and from figures supplied from the former it would appear to have stimulated building very greatly, especially in the case of tenement dwellings. Conditions, however, are so different in the U.S.A. from what they are here, that it is not easy to say how far it is applicable to this country. Local authorities would, of course, object that they were losing the rates which in the natural course would be paid by the new properties, and that the latter would cost them money in the shape of policing, sewerage, etc., which the other ratepayers would have to make good. On the other hand, it may be argued that a valuable rateable property is being created which, at the end of the term of exemption, will be remunerative, and that without the exemption it would not be created at all. The matter is clearly one which could only be carried out with State assistance.

There is much to be said for the plan of direct payments per house to private builders; but the objection to it is that it would throw on the taxpayers of to-day a very large immediate burden, and that in view of our heavy taxation this could not be tolerated. The subsidy system, on the other hand, spreads the burden over a term of years. Unfortunately, a subsidy is of no use to the private builder, especially to the small speculative builder, who builds to sell, and by the nature of his occupation cannot hold. He makes his profit by turning his money over as rapidly as possible. The Government, however, for the reason given above, have adopted the subsidy plan, promising 6*l.* a house for twenty years, which is estimated to represent half the loss on the smaller type of house to which the subsidy is limited, the local authority finding the other half.

This plan has some obvious advantages. In the first place, it strictly limits the liability of the State, which under the Addison scheme was unlimited. This limitation will render extensive supervision and control from Whitehall unnecessary. If the local authority chooses to be extravagant and to spend more than half the estimated loss on the houses, this will be no concern of the State, the additional burden falling on the rate-payers. The State will merely satisfy itself that the houses for which the subsidy is given are of the type prescribed by the Act, i.e. the smallest type. A great deal of controversy has arisen over the question as to whether the houses should have parlours or not. With the extension of the maximum from 850 to 950 superficial feet, there can be no doubt that parlour houses can be provided; but in this connexion two considerations must be borne in mind. First of all, it is the fact that a very large number of the working classes live in non-parlour houses, preferring them on account of the cheaper rents, and in many cases they never use the parlours when they have got them. In the second place, and this is most important, the Government should certainly not subsidise any type of house except such as they are certain would not be built without a subsidy. The only justification for subsidising building at all is that without it the houses will not be forthcoming.

Another criticism, and a very absurd one, has been

made that because the Government propose to allow 20 houses to be built to the acre instead of only 12, which was the number adopted by Dr Addison, they are creating slums. Do the people who talk like this realise that the real slums usually contain 50 to 60 houses to the acre, and very often more? The Brady Street area, Bethnal Green, now being cleared by the L.C.C., had 528 houses on 7 acres, or an average of over 75 houses to the acre. The Crosby Row area of just over one acre had 88 houses. Twelve houses to the acre may be an excellent arrangement for a garden suburb, consisting of houses of different types, when the larger help to carry the smaller; but for a scheme consisting exclusively of the smaller type it is hopelessly extravagant. If anybody thinks that 20 houses to the acre create a slum he should visit the White Hart Lane housing scheme at Tottenham, the older part of which has considerably more than 20 houses to the acre, but anything less like a slum cannot be imagined.

The Government scheme possesses the further advantage that it distinctly encourages private enterprise. Though the subsidy is to be paid to the local authorities, it is laid down that they need not build themselves, but may 'assist private building enterprise' in various ways. In fact they are only to build themselves in cases where they satisfy the Minister of Health that the needs of the area can best be met by their so doing.

The methods by which they may assist private enterprise are by borrowing money and making lump sum grants to builders; or by paying the whole or part of the rates for a period of years on the houses built; or by paying part of the interest on money advanced by a building society. These are very valuable provisions and should result in the erection of a large number of houses. The chief objection to them is that certain local authorities will undoubtedly insist on building themselves, and it will not be easy for the Minister to compel them to employ private enterprise. Many local authorities have in recent years become greatly enamoured of municipal building and ownership, and it should be remembered that in the case of no inconsiderable number the Socialist Labour Party have a majority on the Councils. Every effort must be made

by the Government to see that the clear intention of the Bill is carried out.

There are other proposals in the Bill such as payments to public utility societies and amendments of the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act which may prove to be of great value; but the measure is in the main a temporary one intended to tide over an abnormal period. It is assumed that such a period may last for rather more than two years, during which time the subsidies will be granted and (presumably) rent restriction will remain in force. As such it is probably the best thing which can be done at the moment. Had it indeed been foreseen when the Bill was being prepared that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have so large a realised surplus in the year 1922-23 as a hundred millions, it might have been better to have diverted part of this from the repayment of debt under the Old Sinking Fund to financing housing by direct Treasury payments to private builders, even if this had technically involved reborrowing. Assuming the capital loss on a small house to be 100*l.* at present prices, and that the State made this good, 100,000 such houses could have been provided in this way by a contribution from the Exchequer of ten million pounds, or if we put the loss at 125*l.* by one of twelve million five hundred thousand pounds. It would still have been open to local authorities to build under Part III of the principal Act without State assistance, which a certain number were prepared to do; or the State might have granted them subsidies in cases where it was clear that private enterprise would not build. In any case it is earnestly to be hoped that by the end of 1925 sufficient houses will have been provided to enable the country to dispense with both subsidies and rent restriction. In this way only can we expect to return to economic conditions, and bring back private enterprise fully into play. The alternative is the permanent establishment of a most dangerous form of Municipal Socialism.

ARTHUR G. BOSCAWEN.

## Art. 4.—THE HERITAGE OF THE ACTOR.

A PLAY is material for acting. It may be far more, but it must be that to begin with. The actor brings it to a technical completion. This, no doubt, puts the matter from the actor's point of view, and while the truth is indisputable, the emphasis of the statement may be misleading. Even so, this point of view counts; if only because, when we bring a play to the theatre, the actor's is the last word in the matter—till the public has its say. If it be argued that the play is implicitly complete when it leaves the author's hands, that the actor's business is interpretation merely, that he can, in truth, add nothing to and take nothing away from the material a competent playwright has given him—

There was once, in the 17th century, a gentleman, who, coming out of church on a Sunday morning, found a week-day companion sitting in the stocks.

"What have they put you there for?" he asked.

"Getting drunk."

"Nonsense," said the church-goer, who was a legally-minded man; "they can't put you in the stocks for being drunk."

"Zooks!" said the unfortunate reveller. "But they have!"

It is useless to argue that actors can add nothing to and take nothing from the material the playwright gives them. The answer is that they do.

This final part of the dramatic process, this putting of a play upon the stage, is, indeed, a distressingly incalculable thing. Certainly it is interpretation, but no other kind of interpretation quite compares with it. Musicians have instruments that are more or less mechanical to perform on; even singers are tied, stave by stave, to definite notes. Singers and players will tell us, however, that they should be left ample discretion. They may add that the meticulous method of writing music is quite modern, that composers of the 18th century and earlier were content to put down on paper what they considered the essentials, and to leave far more to the artistry of their interpreters.

But let any one familiar with play production ask

himself what the final effect would be if the actors felt called upon to do no more than speak a speech as the author was good enough to pronounce it to them, trippingly upon the tongue. A certain regardless beauty might result. There are plays that, at first thought, would seem to profit by this treatment. Greek tragedy, with its use of mask and cothurnus, asks for its acting a voice and a presence, and little else; though, even so, it may be found that concentration upon this single means of expression rather heightens than diminishes a personality that *can* so express itself. But in a play which pictures human intercourse in accustomed terms, if the actor did not do something more than repeat its words with such understanding and emotion as they immediately suggested to him, pointing them with appropriate gesture, the result would be unbearably flat and quite unconvincing.

What, then, is the 'something more' he is expected to contribute? His personality. What, then, is the extension of this in the terms of his art to be? Drama ranges from the austerity of Greek tragedy to the freedom of the *Commedia dell' Arte*; and it is not for one manifestation of it, however respectable, however popular, to deny the validity of any other. The antics of Harlequin are not essentially different from the art that shows us *Oedipus*. But, to bring the question to a practical and a more or less topical issue, let us rule out both drama that is largely ritual and drama that is inchoate. Let us assume a play conceived by an author in essential completeness, and marked down for interpretation as minutely as words will do it.

There is a story of an actress of genius who was being conducted through a rehearsal of her part by a producer of great ability. 'Miss ——,' he said, 'you go here and there and here; and you do this and that and this.' 'Thank you,' she replied, with perfect docility. 'Yes, I think I understand. I go there and here and there, and I do that and this and that. And then I do the little bit extra, don't I, for which you really pay me my salary?' Or, as she might have put it, even more informingly, 'Then I *am* the little bit extra which no one can teach me to be.'

The dramatist has a right to expect that any actor, of

the required sex and of the right age and appearance—picked out of a list, called off the rank as it were—will be able to say and do with perfect efficiency whatever can be set down for him to say and do. This right, like many others, is often in abeyance. But, with the expectation fulfilled, the dramatist will still ask the actor to be something besides. At times, no doubt, this 'being' is offensive. We have all seen plays swamped by an elaborate exhibition of some one personality. We have, on the other hand, seen plays of the poorest sort enriched beyond recognition by the imposition—as upon one of those vague backgrounds used by Victorian photographers—of vivid characters, springing, if not from the imagination of the actors of them, then from where? Irving's Mathias will certainly not be found in the original manuscript of 'The Bells.' And if one is to be told that it was in some mysterious fashion innate in the story and the play as Erckmann-Chatrian and the adapter wrote them, one must ask further: was Coquelin's conception of the innkeeper-murderer innate there too? If so, the authors had an uncommonly accommodating or a somewhat divided mind.

The dramatist demands personality; an indefinable thing, and, alas, he is seldom content with the concrete specimen of it that he gets. It is amusing to watch him at rehearsal while he sees the characters growing quite unlike his own innocent idea of them. If he is altogether a novice, the fascination of seeing them live and move is usually sufficient compensation. But novelists turned playwrights are apt to be agonised by the phenomenon. Experience—and a little sympathy with the difficulties of the actor—will teach them how what is essential may be kept alive and true to the play's purpose if incidentals are not rigidly insisted on. Does the author refuse to admit any such division? Authors, grown expert enough in the whole business to instruct each actor to a nicety, have been known to do so. They make their choice, then, between the letter and the spirit, and they may find that by insistence upon the letter they have—for sensitive auditors at least—taken away the very life of the play's performance.

Not but that the author may suffer in a hundred ways by an actor's freedom to inform his part with life. I

can myself recall a performance in which an actor—well-intentioned too—gave what was rather a destructive criticism than a representation of the character he was playing. The author thought he had written a not unsympathetic hero. The actor proved conclusively to the audience that the fellow was nothing of the kind. He may have been right; but the author could not unreasonably have remarked that there were critics enough in the stalls and that it was not an actor's business to do their work for them. Reverse the process; let the actor take a sordid character and invest it with distinction and charm, and still the author is not grateful. He will prefer the child of his fancy to this changeling, even though the changeling be a fairy. The work of the modern theatre, however, where authors and actors of average ability are concerned, is done, as a whole, upon the basis of a compromise by which the author provides essentials and the actor incidentals to taste. That modern invention, the producer, is the honest broker brought in to effect it. It answers, doubtless; and the bulk of the work done under it may be pleasing enough. But is there no more to be said? For there is no future in a compromise.

And the theatre finds itself to-day, not in any more trouble than usual (it is always in trouble), but facing a curiously ambiguous outlook for the future. For two things have happened recently in England. Every one has learned to read, almost every one has taken to reading fiction (some of it disguised, as fact!). And the Cinema has become an institution. The first event did not rob the theatre of its devotees; there was no reason that it should. Theatre-going is a social act, though in England less so regarded than elsewhere; and the enjoyment of narrative is no good substitute for the excitement of mimic action. But cinema-going is a social act too, and—'Movies'; the very word spells action and excitement. Now it is too soon to say—it will always be too soon to say—how the art of the cinema may develop. There is no reason to suppose that, as industries, theatre and cinema cannot exist side by side, for the theatre has many resources (as we shall argue) that the cinema can hardly draw upon. But it is fairly certain that the story in action—that extension of the

narrative fiction, for which such a widespread taste has been cultivated—will remain the cinema's chief aim, and that the theatre therefore will tend to be ousted from this part of its ancient preserve.

It is instructive to examine the cinema's dealing with material that has been or well might be used by the theatre. There is, very naturally, a revolt from the unities, from that 'general oneness' so dear to the heart of Mr Curdle—and Aristotle. Continuity of action, with the variety attendant upon it, is favoured as against the elaborate development of particular episodes. In so far, indeed, as the cinema is disposed to lean on dramatic technique at all, it returns rather to the cruder methods of the Elizabethan, even of the Mediæval stage. Little is left for the imagination to account for. It is as if the scientific discovery, by which the swiftly revolving shutter makes the pictures appear to move, had laid down artistic law. The story is chopped up into little pieces, then cemented again into a long episodic line. The cinema has certainly revived the Mediæval dumb-show and our delight in it.

It is specially instructive to note, when a play is transferred to the screen, how much dialogue can be eliminated without peril to our understanding, or even to our enjoyment of the story. The skill of the producer is very properly directed to removing what—the picture being now the thing—has become mere excrescence. [It follows that plays which depend upon poetry, upon wit, upon analysis of character, are very weak vessels in the eye—in the brilliantly winking eye—of the camera.] And, if there are degrees in the matter, this is truest of poetry, our great begetter of emotion in the theatre. The cinema deals in excitement; only by indirect means does it beget emotion. Hence, no doubt, its invariable accompaniment by music, for an arbitrary stimulus to the feelings.

As an entertainment the cinema has one further difference; it asks no response from its audience. Go to a play, and unless you are insensitive indeed, you will be drawn to some sympathy with the actors. It may take the form of admiration (the form, no doubt, that actors prefer), it may be reduced to mere pity for fellow-creatures making such fools of themselves. But in some

form or other it will be there. You will, if you analyse your feelings, be brought to some sense of responsibility for the conduct of the entertainment as a whole. An exhibition of giggling bad manners by one of your neighbours can easily put this to a test. If you do not protest, you will at least feel ashamed.

But, watching a 'Movie,' what does its foolishness matter? The actors are far away, both in space and in time. What consideration need be shown to their flickering images on a screen? Equally, what enthusiasm can such images arouse, except in the minds of children (of whatever age) to whom illusion still is life and the discretionary enjoyment of art a thing unknown? This environment of irresponsibility may add to the cinema's popularity in an irresponsible age. But one doubts whether an art that cannot stimulate emotion and that asks for no more judgment or support from its audience than is involved in their paying or not paying, their staying or going, can ever take a very deep hold. One might even find refuge in fogeyism and question its right in the outcome—whatever aesthetic efforts may be spent in preparation—to be considered an art at all. But, art or no art, if the cinema is in the future to steal some part of the theatre's thunder, what had the theatre best do about it? We see well enough how the industrial part of the question is being answered. Landlords, dramatists, and actors are putting money in their purses while they can. What preparation, though, is the indisputable of the drama making for a generation that is per growing up to think of a play in relation to a Movie as the children of 1880, riding in express trains, thought of a coach-and-four?

If an art may have a policy it would seem as if the first thing needful were the envisaging of what the drama can do unapproachably, of what it can be at its best that neither kindred arts nor pseudo-arts can be. For in this must lie its strength to face a future, however ambiguous. Its history has been marked by defections, from which, in some ways it has gathered strength. Dancing and music deserted, to set up on their own account as ballet and opera. Drama on the whole does better without them.

Certainly, late in the 17th century it struck up one doubtful alliance with the scenic art, by which it has benefitted a little and suffered a lot ; the Artist (with a capital A) being a difficult partner to keep in his place, once he has scented the footlights, and an appeal to the thing seen being ever the simplest to make. Four boards and a passion, it has been said, are all the equipment that drama needs, and it is a saying to be taken to heart. Here are the things that drama has never surrendered ; her unrivalled riches. First, the fellowship set up between actors and audience on the strength of the fellowship of imagination between the actors themselves. Next, the power of the spoken word. And in these two things the power and the quality of the art must lie.

Now it is worth noting, incidentally, that the final framing-in of the picture stage (which preceded by a generation the invention of 'the pictures') led in time to the loss of that emotional intimacy by which our 'classic' drama had re-inforced doubly and trebly its poetry and humour. The discovery of the loss was tardy ; partly because the poetic play and 18th-century comedy dropped out of fashion just then, partly because actors of authority, who knew what the old ways were, adapted them skilfully enough to the new conditions. Even so there was much critical mourning over Macbeths that were not what they used to be, and Schools for Scandal as dull as ditchwater.

This is worth noting because it points so directly to the reliance once placed—apart from any virtues in the play itself—upon the relation between actors and audience. This relation bred (unfortunately for the drama as a whole perhaps) a race of actors who, by cultivating it, could make the very poorest play attractive—even as a music-hall comedian can now keep his audience in a roar over nothing at all. But, aesthetically, it was not of necessity an unworthy relation. No one can read of Garrick and Mrs Siddons and Kean ; of King and Mrs Abington and Palmer ; no one can have seen a William Farren play Sir Peter Teazle according to tradition, and suppose so. And it would be idle to pretend that in erecting the barrier of a complete illusion between actors and audience the art of the theatre has lost nothing,

whatever it may have gained. The arising of a generation of actors that feel as helpless upon the apron at Garrick's Drury Lane (which just from the actor's standpoint keeps all the advantage of Shakespeare's Globe) as they would in the ring of a circus, will involve the disappearance of Shakespeare and Sheridan from the stage, except as excuses for pageantry or academic exercises. This disappearance has indeed seemed imminent; it still may be. Here and there the mechanical remedy has been applied, when old plays are under treatment, of breaking down the illusion by providing an apron stage and encouraging the actor to come out upon it and 'be a Garrick,' so to speak. But the trouble may not be quite so simply curable.

And what of the modern drama? It is as useless to expect the playwright of to-day to go back on the 'illusionary' theory as it would be to ask Mr Sargent to paint like Giotto. Besides, this would be to imply that in the illusionary stage we have nothing to be grateful for. We have much. One need not muster names, or even suppose that the playwrights who have flourished during the last fifty years and whose work measures up in average quality with any the theatre has seen could not have done as well—though they must have done very differently—working to another technique. The 'could' and 'should' argument in matters of art is always exasperatingly futile, whether it bears on the past or the present; whether, as in this instance, it is how Shakespeare ought to have written for footlights and scenery, or Ibsen might have constructed *Hedda Gabler* for the bare boards of the Globe.

But it will be owned that this latest period of development in drama has been the playwright's period, not the actor's. Has it not often brought actor and playwright to odds, now openly, now—for good reasons of bread-and-butter—as politely as you please? Once, at a public dinner, Ibsen was congratulated upon the magnificent parts his plays provided for their interpreters. The old gentleman scowled terrifically. 'Parts!' he said, when he rose to speak; 'I do not write parts. I create men and women.' On the other hand, could the talk of actors gathered together at many a private dinner during the last forty years be recorded, it would rise

to Heaven as the discordant wail of a crushed and desolated race.

The quarrel, I repeat, may seldom be particularised. A theatre is the happiest of workshops and its controllers have to learn that happiness is a necessary part of its efficiency. And, as I have suggested, in practice these conflicting interests are accommodated by a compromise. Let there be so much sheer interpretation of the part I have written, so much exploiting, my dear Mr So-and-so, of your personality. Never, of course, is it put in so many words, or even thought of with so brutal a clarity. And where the domination of either author or producer on the one hand, or of actor on the other, is perfect and unquestioned, no overt difference will be detected. The author murmurs approvingly from the shrouded stalls, or the actors obediently note that they are not only to do but to feel this and that and no more. Five minutes—five seconds!—at a rehearsal or performance will tell the experienced observer which regime is in force. Some rehearsals, doubtless, run their course upon a basis of conflict to a goal of haphazard performance. If the play is a success—and good plays and bad plays, bad performances of them and good ones, succeed and fail equally—no one concerned asks any questions. If it is a failure, the author feels, ‘Ah, if *my play* had had a chance . . . !’ and the actors either ‘Ah, if I’d only had something to act . . . !’ or ‘If they’d only have let me *act it*!’ It is a stupid quarrel. And what is its result, in ensuing or suppression, for the playgoer? That good actors often prefer bad plays; and that good plays are too often deplorably badly acted.

If this is the dramatist’s day, he will be wise to consider the actor, not as a mere appendage to his work, but as its very life-giver. Let him realise that the more he can learn to ask of the actor the more will he gain for his play. But asking is giving. He must give opportunity.

An author may have a thesis to expound or an exciting story to tell. A pamphlet will serve him for one and a novel for the other; or if the matter be all excitement, there is, as aforesaid, the cinema. A play has far other, far wider, artistic purposes. Aristotle laid it down—with that positiveness which in an ancient Greek is supposed, for some reason, to silence all

argument—that dramatic action must not be thought of with a view to the representation of character, that the incidents and plot are the end of a tragedy; and the end is the chief thing of all. To prove this, apparently, he further remarks that without action there cannot be a tragedy (which is obviously true), but that there may be without character. In some logical sense, no doubt, there may—and a very dull affair it would be. But perhaps wise playwrights do not read their Aristotle, lest they should be in danger of having to differ from him. For they will remember that every great play of the last three centuries and more holds its place in virtue of character and not of plot. Why do we go to see a play that we really like again and again? (And return visits are the test; in music, in painting, in drama.) Not to have the story re-told us, however ingeniously it may be told. It is the elucidation of character that does not pall; and it is in this—all virtosity, all that is learnable allowed for—that the actor's art finds its final task and its true achievement. As with the actor, so with the playwright; construction and the rest of it are as learnable as is good speaking and the tricks of painting the face; but either he can create men and women in terms of dramatic action or he cannot. And nothing else finally counts. He need not, however, with Ibsen, disdain to think of them as parts to be played. That was in its time, perhaps, a wholesome protest against the actor's egoism. But it has become—frankly—a piece of snobbery and no more. For now as always it is the power of the actor, adopting the speech and action of the author's imagining, to elucidate the character in the terms of his own personality that gives the thing that apparent spontaneity of life which is the drama's peculiar virtue.

We speak most appropriately of *reviving* an old play; and new actors do in a very real sense give it new life. The fact that (if it has been, to begin with, vitally conceived) it is capable of being interpreted in the terms of another set of personalities (as indeed it may be to some degree variously treated by the same actors time after time) is the chief reason why we can go back to it, not merely as we go back to a familiar novel or poem, but often to receive—though expectancy is rash—

a fresher, more vivid enjoyment than that which it first gave us. It is said in the theatre that no actor ever quite fails as Hamlet. That is truer than it sounds; moreover, it goes far to tell us why Hamlet is the most popular play in the world, not so much with actors, who can indeed fail quite sufficiently in it to be chary of the risk, but with the ever-changing, never-changing public. Popular plays are plays that 'act well.' And the better a play and the better a part the more can an actor find to do in it, and the greater variety of acting will it accommodate.

Modern drama, the actor may tell us, does not give him the chances that the old did. But in much of it there is more for him to do than he is apt to think. For he thinks of great acting too often in terms of the past; his mind stalks that apron-stage of Garrick's. Or, worse, he thinks of it *in vacuo*. His secret heart asks for a play which shall be but a colourable preparation and excuse for his doing something emotionally tremendous. He wants to 'capture' his audience, he yearns (quite rightly) after that emotional intimacy with them which will bring them to crying when he gives the cue and laughing when he laughs, without ever asking the reason why. His instinct tells him indeed that the less reason has to do with it the more satisfying his job will be. Set him free, he feels, to appeal to the hearts of the people and all will be well. Again, he is right from his point of view. All *will* be well enough for that moment of triumph; and he is not responsible for the after-questionings of an audience convalescent from their attack of this Dionysiac disease. What was it all about? That has to be the author's concern; and *he* may—or may not—have a reputation for sanity which he cares to preserve.

In the day of the dramatist, therefore, the actor must not seek that sort of emancipation. He must—it is the only way in art—break to new liberty through fulfilment. Modern plays make demands on him that, he may often think, are less in degree than he deserves; but, as he may even oftener omit to notice, these differ almost in kind from the old demands. Until he has exhausted the possibilities there are he cannot justly reproach—well, he will not wisely reproach—the authors

of his histrionic being (if now they have the whip hand of him) with not providing more.

This is one side of the matter. Incidentally, we should never be angry, or even amused, if the actor, once the play is delivered to him, seems to look on it for the time being as so much personal adornment. Off the stage (if he is ever off the stage) he generally doesn't; he is as often too humble-minded. On the stage, better really encourage him to do so. Assumption of character is a difficult business. It involves a quite desperate abandonment of self, a loosing hold of self-confidence, and a touch of arrogance may be a help and a little comfort. Certainly the actor whose performance is but a deferential protest that all this is really more the author's affair than his, is not worth his salt.

The modern dramatist's side of the case begins with a justification, but ends, it may be, with a question. His demands on the actor do differ greatly from the old demands, and the actor has been slow to recognise it. One need not here try to trace the process of change. In such matters the march is often enough two steps forward to one back and to several sideways. But the landmark which divides past from present is a change in the convention of illusion; and from this, once made, change after change has sprung. Plays can be found that straddle the boundary; drama may come to recrossing it, or may pass on over another; it is possible to argue the difference away. But the plain fact is that the writer of to-day, setting himself to mirror some fraction of contemporary life in dramatic form, goes to work under technical obligations that a century ago could have found no application at all, that fifty years back were but emerging from the tangle of an older, a much worn tradition. If they are not to be stated in a phrase or in a dozen phrases, they are none the less obvious. One might try, not quite successfully, to round them in with a paradox by saying that the footlights which symbolise the illusion of the picture stage now destroy the very division between actors and audience that they first made. Drama's aim has not changed. This is still to create an emotional intimacy between these two; only the means to the end have shifted, have indeed finally been reversed. For—paradox apart—by

the old method the stage and the actor were brought into the midst of the audience, by the new the audience is lured in imagination on the stage; if it can be hypnotised, even, into forgetting that such a thing as a stage exists, so much the better. Wherefore the 'realistic setting' has been perfected. We have rooms that we may regard as our own, fires that crackle, lights that our fingers twitch to turn up or down, doors that shut and bang with a familiar sound. It is interesting to remember that the end of 'The Doll's House'—of the play which began this movement—was the banging of a door.

To such realism naturally belongs realism, or—if one rejects that abused word—verisimilitude of speech and action and of the drawing of character generally. Now, cause and effect in the development of an art are hard to distinguish. Let us only say then, that these things have in turn been the occasion of a great change of content in plays. The actor must follow where the dramatist leads. Here he has hung back, he has protested, and he has had times of real and times of false enthusiasm for the new thing. He has often succeeded in coaxing the dramatist aside for an old-fashioned frolic. But, on the main path, he has had to follow. And the dramatist—this might be his protest—now puts him in a world which is sometimes far too like the real one to be at all amusing. He is expected to know what a bishop, a stockbroker, a politician, a Frenchman, a Lincolnshire farmer, or a Scottish professor really are like. He is asked, moreover, to devote himself, even by the complete suppression of himself, to exhibiting the commonplace and expounding the abstruse, not to murmur if, when the exhibiting and expounding suffices the purpose of the play, he is bundled unceremoniously out of it, not to complain if he can only find in the paper the next morning that 'the performance was adequate.' No wonder he thinks enviously of Edmund Kean and of 'loud applause' punctuating every few lines of a performance, and of the days when a Mercutio, after departing to die, promptly returned to bow to the cheering, while Romeo and the rest stood around and the play itself waited his triumph's pleasure.

A generation of actors has already grown up, perhaps,

that takes its new leading-strings for granted ; otherwise the consequent question would be put more insistently than it is. I will try to put it. Has the dramatist, busy reconstituting his own art to gain full advantage from this theatre of the new illusion, given enough thought to all that the art of the actor has to gain from it ? Has, in fact, the art of the actor gained in these days of the dramatist's dominance ? And, if not, must not any gain to drama itself be but a very partial gain ?

There has lately been revolt against verisimilitude. The dramatists themselves look round for ways of emancipation. But the revolt has been led—oddly enough—not by the actor but by designers of scenery. The actor would have been wise to make the quarrel his own and to make it a quarrel of principle. His is the case, but he has let the best of it go to snatch petty advantages here and there. And the scene designer fights, not in his interest at all, but against him.

This revolt against dry verisimilitude was bound to come. Objective truth is well enough ; but without emotion and the beauty that springs from it, the theatre simply cannot continue to exist. Ibsen, the great protagonist of serious social drama, was a genius and a poet to boot ; and in his later plays the poet is found bursting the bonds of the form the playwright has perfected. But of his followers, not many have been either geniuses or poets, and their work has often been dull—conscientious, but dull. And now we have the scene designer, and even the engineer of the electric light, raising the banner of beauty for beauty's sake, and promising to restore to the theatre all the romantic glory it has lost with increase a thousandfold, if we will but surrender ourselves to their spell-binding, and if actor and dramatist both, like good little boys, will do as they are bid.

It is a strange claim. Ibsen and Shakespeare in the shades must wonder indeed when it comes echoing to them that, for their work to have full value for the theatre, it must be made 'expressionistic.' Actors, remembering their great predecessors, must feel a little bored when they are recommended to be 'presentational,' or to wear masks, or, on occasion, to abdicate altogether in favour of marionettes. Already we have had 'Macbeth'

and 'Richard III' interpreted by scenic symbolism—which riveted the audience's attention no doubt, kept people awake wondering what they'd see next. But the actor of Macbeth must have reflected somewhat earlier in the play than is usual, that life was indeed but a walking shadow, and that he, perhaps, was an idiot as well as a poor player to be spending his sound and fury against such odds. 'Hamlet' with the Prince of Denmark left out is too good a joke not to be taken in earnest sometime. Are we to have a company of mere human beings revolving round some mighty symbol of morbid indecision; a pillar of light, it might be, registering moods by ranging through the spectrum, with a little music to help?

Seriously, there are more appropriate—would it be rude to say saner?—ways of restoring emotion and beauty to the drama. But unless they are sought for, we shall continue to be fascinated and bamboozled by this sort of thing. Scenery has its place in the theatre, and a sufficiently honourable one. Quite excusably, men of talent who devote themselves to its designing will spread their wings and test their power to its limits. But let them either leave plays and acting out of account altogether, let them, indeed, practise a new art of their own; or let them, their flights over, return to the bedrock fact, that the function of scenery is to be a background for the play's interpreter, the actor. This is its place, and, finally, it must be content to stay there.

The beauty of sublimated human emotion; that is the beauty which properly pertains to drama. Without this and its complements of wit and humour, drama will die, and neither brains in the playwright nor the splashing of paint will avail to save it. But there is no need whatever to suppose that the technique of the modern play of verisimilitude is outworn or that its gains to the dramatist must be abandoned in a search for beauty and emotional power. And the gain to drama itself will be entire if the actor can be brought to contribute more largely from his own peculiar resources, the resources of human emotion. Not how to stifle or supersede this in the name of his own new freedom, but how to employ it to new and to subtler purpose should be the dramatist's problem. But—this must be recognised—it is the problem of a partnership. It will not be solved under the tyranny

of dramatist or actor. In the lack of a fruitful recognition of this the scene designer has come thrusting in where really he has no business. His interference has resulted in a most beneficent improvement of bad scenery into good. But, if it is to be a question of the development of drama itself—no, no ; let him mind his paint-pots.

We may sense what is wrong, yet wisely be chary of dogmatising upon its putting right. Certainly it is futile to request dramatists to give actors better chances of acting, to turn out plays containing such and such ingredients in such and such proportion—as if the making of plays were one with the making of puddings or pills. And the actor's practical difficulty—once he forswears the ideal of a tame dramatist who will make him a play as his cook makes him puddings—is that he must act what he finds to act. Once in a while arises the actor-dramatist who, like Molière, continues in both crafts. There are modern instances ; in America, William Gillette ; in France, at this moment, Sacha Guitry. Their work is noticeable, if for nothing else (and, Molière on his pedestal apart, it is often noticeable for a great deal else), for the nice adjustment of the play's content to the actor's opportunity. Otherwise, it may be no more in the best plays than in the worst—if by 'best' is implied a rounded completeness—that the actor will be able to explore the sheer possibilities of his art as the theatre of the new illusion defines it. He could more often, strangely enough, find the occasion in plays in which the dramatist has himself been impatient of the form chosen and has surcharged it with thought or with feeling. It is, in fact, to the dramatist's experiments in the enlargement of his own art that the actor should look for the development of his.

One practical difficulty immediately arises. The theatre, as we know it, provides small opportunity for experiment of any sort. There is always the audience to be thought of, naturally not interested in the art's future, but expecting the entertainment offered to be both rounded and complete, however smooth, however bare with repetition the ways of it may be worn. In the event the public does have to put up with a good deal of experimenting. Playwrights and actors both are encouraged to give their 'prentice hands practice

at its expense to an extent that must make musicians, for instance, disciplined to a hard technical training, simply green with envy. They profit—though Heaven knows the theatre does not—by the public's ignorance of an art which it sets out nevertheless to enjoy. A pity that there should be no more encouragement of true experimenting, by the art's masters, not its 'prentices. For, of all the arts, drama can live least in the light of theory. The dramatist may project his play in imagination pretty completely; the individual actor can at best say what he means his performance to be; few will be rash enough to forecast an exact result for any free and fruitful collaboration of a whole company of actors with the dramatist and among themselves.

We are back to our first admission that this final process of the putting of the play on the stage is a very incalculable thing. And incalculable it must to some extent remain if its chief aim is to be the endowing of the play with anything we are to call life; for the term will escape æsthetic definition. We must join company with the musical critic who, in similar case, disposed of all argument by saying, 'I know a good tune when I hear it.' But no one who—with critical faculties equipped against mere fraud—has seen a play brought fully and freely to life on the stage, will ever again mistake the sham thing for the real; or ever again, one would suppose, be content with the sham; or, it is to be hoped, ever again, knowing the difference between the two, begrudge the actor his full share in the credit of the life-giving process.

What, then, is the actor's case; what should he claim from the modern drama; what has he to offer? The dramatist's chief gain from the theatre of the new illusion and the conventions which belong to it, has been—at the price of some limitation of his power to project things in the doing—a great extension of resource in picturing things as they are. There was more need, as well as more scope, for physical action upon the older stage, even as there was for the spell-binding sway of verse. But by the new illusion the attention of an audience can be focussed upon the smallest details without either words or action being used to mark them, light, darkness, and silence can be made eloquent in

themselves, a whole gamut of effectiveness has been added. It has brought new obligations—of accuracy, of sincerity, of verisimilitude in general, as we have noted. Then gain and loss both must be reflected in the actor's opportunity. His chances of doing are curtailed; in their stead new obligations of being are laid upon him. Can he not turn them to his profit?

One is tempted to imagine a play—to be written in desperate defiance of Aristotle—from which doing would be eliminated altogether, in which nothing but being would be left. The task set the actors of it would be to interest their audience in what the characters *were*, quite apart from anything they might *do*; to set up, that is to say, the relation by which all important human intimacies exist. If the art of the theatre could achieve this it would stand alone in a great achievement.

Plays of an approximate intention do indeed exist; but in England at least, they have never come to their own—even to such limited popularity as might be expected for them. There are reasons for this; the best being that the plays are mostly not English products. And while an English actor may reproduce the doings of a Frenchman or a Russian with sufficient fidelity, we cannot expect him to make real to us such an abstraction as his ‘being.’ So we have usually had the plays with the best part of them left out.

This opens up a line of inquiry worth pursuing for our present purpose. The dramatist must allow for the means of expression that come naturally to the people he is picturing. And expression is a racial thing. But when the influence of a technic of play construction spreads abroad, it is apt to affect plots, character-drawing and dialogue as well, everything but the actual language in which the derivative play may be written. For an instance, take the influence of French drama on English during the last century. We may rightly welcome for their good effect upon our native product French plays acted by Frenchmen, or even their translation; but a century's crowding of our theatre with adaptations has left the English drama full of plots, situations, and figures that may—or may not—have some relation to life in France, but in England must rank as mechanism merely. The average farcical comedy

with its rooms with four doors (French rooms, as well as French stages, do as often as not have four doors), peopled by distorted shadows from the world of the French provinces and the half-world of Paris, the *grande dame*, the *père noble*, the *raisonneur*! Now even when an Englishman passes fifty and it grows hard to stop him talking, he seldom becomes a *raisonneur*. The word and the habit are equally French.

One result of all this, and not the least harmful, is that Englishmen have come to be thought of as a race of bad actors. Naturally they must seem so, when they are encouraged to deny their race in the practice of this most racial of all the arts. It is a nuisance for the English dramatist, no doubt, that his countrymen do not in the ordinary business—even in the extraordinary moments—of life express themselves with fluency. Well, it presents him with a difficulty he must learn to surmount.

He can, of course, call convention to his help. But he must honestly develop the convention and not try to borrow one ready made. There lies one to his hand; and the well-developed use of it might provide at least a partial solution of our problem, might do much to help the actor to his heritage again. Englishmen are not glib, but the essential strength of poetic speech is a tradition with them. By which one does not mean, of course, that they lisp in numbers, or imply that on formal occasions they cannot be academically dull. But in the natural speech of the people there is often that power of expression and concentration of meaning which is the essence of poetry, even though the form be prose. And great English writers, from Shakespeare to Hardy, have known how to sublimate it and make it memorable. The speech of the Wessex peasant is not Mr Hardy's invention, nor did Dickens conjure Sam Weller and Mr Peggotty out of the void. And for as forceful a passage as any in 'Cymbeline,' turn to the gaoler's philosophy of hanging and his 'O the charity of a penny cord!' Indeed, whether it be in form of verse or prose, Shakespeare (once he shook free of the fashionable affectations of his time and but for falling later into some affectations of his own) did but take the common speech of the people of one class and another as material for his magic.

And this seems certain. All dramatic dialogue needs to have something of this particular quality of poetry in it. It must be dynamic speech. Poetry and drama are organically akin even when they seem sundered both by subject and method. They are notably alike in this, for instance, that they call for economy of effect. Consider how short is even the longest play in comparison with a novel. The mere words of many an excellent part could be written with a fine pen on a postcard. The literary man's failure at playwriting is due, nine times out of ten, to his dialogue being so obviously but a convenient means by which he tells his story and of no further value to the play; it is therefore of no value to the actor at all. If dialogue does not serve three purposes at least, to advance the story, to exhibit the one character and provoke the exhibition of another, it fails of its primary purpose, and the play will go floundering. Further, and most importantly, it must be charged with emotion. This lacking, the actor—unless he take matters so into his own hands that the play disappears in the process—is helpless.

And one may hazard an assertion that the modern dramatist's failure to provide due opportunity for his actors is oftenest this: he has discovered no sufficient substitute for the poetry and rhetoric in which lay the acting strength of the old plays. He may write excellent sense, and the audience, hearing it, will yet remain profoundly uninterested. Is the actor to blame? No; dramatic dialogue needs other qualities before it can be made to carry conviction. There is no solution, needless to say, in the dressing up of the play in poetic phrasing or the provision of a purple patch here and there. One must choose a medium and stick to it; only so can illusion be sustained. But the old dramatists did put into the hands—or, rather, into the mouths—of their actors a weapon of great, of magical power, by which, with little else to aid them, they could subdue their hearers to every illusion of a mimic world. Useless to-day to imitate its form, to fancy the strength lay in that. The essentials of it must be sought and somehow found. When found they are recognisable enough. Take any play and read two pages aloud. There can be no mistake. Tested by the living voice, either the language

has life in it or it has not. A difficult medium, no doubt, to master, the prose of common speech which shall yet have the power of poetry. But it is what the actor asks if he is to command belief in his world of make-believe.

To put it in a phrase then; if the actor is to come to his own in the new drama, something the dynamic equivalent of poetry must be given to him as material for his share of the work. Nor is this too hard a saying. The dramatist's task—and the actor's coming after him—is the building up and exhibition of human character, the picturing of men's natures in the intimacies of their working. To this extent it is essentially a poet's task and the means to it are essentially those a poet seeks. A play's content may be what you will, matter for nothing but laughter; its dialogue may take any form whatever, from poetical imagery to the cracking of jokes. But it will be a good play or a poor one, a living thing or dead, in so far as we are brought to accept its inhabitants as fellow-creatures or left indifferent to them. This is true of high tragedy, and even the clown in the pantomime appeals to some innocent knavery in our hearts that would find it great fun to steal sausages, and to wield a red-hot poker that was not too hot.

And magic is needed; the power of the spoken word is a magic power. But the art of the theatre is not a reasonable art. A play's dialogue is an incantation, and the actors must bewitch us with it. They must seem, now to be the commonest sort of folk, now superhuman, and the form of their talk must fit them. But, for all appearance, it must ever be of a trebly-distilled strength. It must have this power of poetry in it. It must be alive with more than the mere meaning of words. In content and in form the modern dramatist has much advanced his art. But still, too often, the worthiest plays will leave us cold, respectful, when we should be deeply moved, or paying them instead of laughter a tolerant smile. What is wrong? This, for one thing, I suggest. The dramatist of the new dispensation has yet, as a rule, to learn both what to ask of his actors and how best to help them to answer the demand.

HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER.

## Art. 5.—AN IMPERIAL AIR POLICY.

1. *The Official History of the War in the Air.* By the late Sir Walter Raleigh. Clarendon Press, 1922.
2. *Aviation in Peace and War.* By Sir F. H. Sykes. Arnold, 1922.
3. *A History of Aeronautics.* By E. C. Vivian and Lt-Col W. Lockwood Marsh. Collins, 1921.
4. *The German Air Force in the Great War.* By Major G. P. Neumann. Hodder and Stoughton, 1921.

THE full development of aviation is of the highest importance to Motherland and Empire. It is of the very greatest value for establishing our security and preserving the peace of the world. It is a most potent factor for consolidating, uniting, and organising the Empire, as well as for promoting trade and increasing national prosperity. 'Defence,' as Adam Smith wisely observed a hundred and fifty years ago, 'is more important than opulence.' Great Britain is the arsenal, the citadel, and the treasury of the Empire. The Empire could most easily be conquered in London. Thus the security of Great Britain against attack is essential to all the States in our Imperial Commonwealth, and, in view of the supreme importance of England's security from attack and defeat in the air, the military aspect of the aviation problem should be considered in the first instance.

In military matters, as in politics, there are always two parties—two great schools of thought—a conservative and a progressive. The older admirals and generals are apt to put their trust into the proved weapons and to view new methods with distrust and dislike; but that attitude of mind, though perfectly intelligible, may prove most dangerous. It has been asserted that William the Conqueror defeated the English because the latter were mainly armed with the weapons of the Stone Age. Superiority in war-material has proved a decisive factor in fighting since the earliest ages. Even the greatest military and naval commanders have made disastrous mistakes by disdaining new discoveries and inventions.

In the beginning, the flying machine was treated as an interesting toy. On March 7, 1907, the First Lord of

the Admiralty wrote to the brothers Wilbur and Orville Wright as to their epoch-making invention :

' I have consulted my expert advisers with regard to your suggestion as to the employment of aeroplanes, and I regret to have to tell you, after the careful consideration of my Board, that the Admiralty, whilst thanking you for so kindly bringing the proposal to their notice, are of opinion that they would not be of any practical service to the Naval Service.'

Germany was encouraged to go to war in 1914, partly because she was far ahead of all other nations in regard to her mechanical outfit. Had it not been for her great superiority in the heaviest artillery, in quick-firing guns, in aviation, and in chemical weapons, she would scarcely have embarked on the disastrous adventure. Her great strength in those directions enabled her to escape defeat through four years of warfare. Infantry and cavalry can be improvised in case of need, but the scientific weapons require years of labour for their development. The war was much protracted because the Allies had neglected heavy artillery, aviation, and chemical warfare, and it took them years to make up for their neglect. It almost seemed as if history might repeat itself if Great Britain should be involved in further hostilities. We have drastically reduced our army and navy and have almost destroyed the most potent and most promising weapon of all—the air weapon.

When the War was concluded, the British Air Force consisted of about 300,000 officers and men. At present, it amounts only to some 30,000. The number of aeroplanes has diminished at a similar ratio. The reduction of our air strength would perhaps not matter so much if other nations had reduced their Air Forces in a similar manner. But that is not the case. The position, in fact, is highly alarming. On March 21, Lord Birkenhead stated in the House of Lords :

' If I understand aright the information given by the Secretary of State for Air in another place, at the present moment Great Britain has 371 service machines, and France has 1260 service machines. In 1925, if the present programmes are maintained and not amended, Great Britain

will have 575 service machines and France 2180. The number of squadrons at the moment is—Great Britain 34, France about 84. . . . If you take the disposition of forces for home defence, Great Britain has assigned five squadrons of which four, I believe, are bombing squadrons, and only one a fighting squadron. I believe at this moment there is only one fighting squadron, but the noble Duke will check my statement on this point. There exist at present in France available for home defence, available for any sudden purpose, 44 squadrons, of which 32 are fighting squadrons. . . . In 1922 we built in this country 200 aeroplanes altogether for civil and military purposes. France built in 1922, 3300, of which 3000 were military and 300 civil. . . .

'What so many people are apt to forget is this, that this very vital function which was discharged all those years in the past by the Navy must, so far as the greater ambit and range of it are concerned, be discharged in the future by the Air Force, and as we could not claim security for the people of this country in the past unless our Fleet was adequate, so, to-day, we are entirely lacking in our duty to the people of this country, unless we are able to afford them the guarantee of an Air Force which can defend them from attack.'

Replying to Lord Birkenhead, the Under Secretary of State for Air, the Duke of Sutherland, said :

'The learned Earl's figures for British machines were quite correct; that is to say, 34 squadrons and 395 machines; but the French figures he gave were not quite correct. According to our latest information, the French figures are 140 squadrons and 1260 machines—I think the noble and learned Earl said they had 84 squadrons. One hundred and eleven of these French squadrons are at home and 29 overseas. I think he said that the number of British squadrons at home now were five, but the number is ten, and will, I think, be fourteen, because, although there are only five purely home defence squadrons, there are five other squadrons attached to the Army and Navy and working with them, which makes ten squadrons in all, together with four further squadrons which would be at home but for the fact that they are at the present moment at the Dardanelles. By 1925 the British machine figures will have been increased to 575 at the present rate of expansion, and the French machine figures to about 2180, on the assumption that no alterations are made in the programme of expansion which has still to pass the French Chamber and Senate. . . .

'Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that three-quarters

of the total French Air Force is kept at home in France while nearly two-thirds of our squadrons have at present to be permanently overseas, leaving only fourteen squadrons at home. This is chiefly due to the geographical position of the British Empire. It must be remembered that the Mediterranean, Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, and India, at which 20 squadrons of the Royal Air Force are normally stationed, lie at a far greater distance from the British Isles than Algeria, Tunis, Morocco, or Syria do from France. . . .

'In conclusion, if we wish to raise the Royal Air Force to a one-Power standard on the basis of the present French strength, we shall have to face immediately an expenditure of 23,000,000*l.* per annum; whilst, if, and when, the full French programme of expansion is carried into effect, this figure will have to be increased to 35,000,000*l.* per annum.'

The position disclosed in these two speeches is disquieting and even alarming. With regard to the most powerful and the most promising weapon, the British position has deteriorated to such an extent that it may almost be said that Great Britain no longer counts as a military factor in comparison with France. Unfortunately, France is not the only nation which recognises the supreme necessity of a strong and ever-ready air force. Under the guidance of Signor Mussolini, Italy will apparently create an Air Force able to meet that of the French, and the United States of America certainly does not intend to be aerially inferior to France.

The call for economy is, of course, the substantial explanation of our weakened air-strength. But the other great European Powers, though still more needing to cut down national expenditure, have been impressed with the absolute necessity of maintaining a strong position in the air. How is it that France, with far less taxation and no unemployment problem, can afford to spend so much more on her Air Force and Aviation generally? Moreover, there is far less excuse for reducing our air strength than applies in the case of our land and sea forces; partly because future warfare is likely to be associated with the air; while air attack is almost certain to be the initial form of offence against this country.

With regard to attacks from the air, Great Britain is eminently vulnerable. It would, indeed, be no exaggera-

tion to say that this country is the most vulnerable in the world. We are absolutely dependent on imported food for our existence. Occasionally the stock of bread corn suffices only for a few weeks. Whenever our stores run low, a short blockade might cause general starvation and force the nation to its knees. It scarcely needs lengthy argument and description to show that the food-ships travelling to this country can more easily be turned back or destroyed by a predominant Air Force, even if relatively small in number, than by a very large number of submarines and surface ships.

There is even a still greater danger than that of blockading these islands from the air. The position of London invites bombardment with high explosives, gas, chemicals. London lies nearer the sea border than any central European capital. While only about one-tenth of the French live in Paris, about one-fifth of the British live in London. London can easily be found in any weather because of its huge size and especially because of the Thames. In Paris, Berlin, and Vienna and other capitals tall houses provided with deep cellars are general. The people may find shelter against high explosive bombs in the cellars, and, if heavy gas is used, may take refuge in the upper stories of houses. The vast majority of the people of London live in low houses unprovided with underground cellars. If London is bombarded with gas which rises to an altitude of twenty or thirty feet, the great majority of the population might be exterminated within a very short time.

The air weapon and the chemical weapon proved their enormous power during the War. Since the armistice, both aviation and chemical warfare have progressed greatly. As has been already implied, the air weapon and the chemical weapon cannot be improvised. It takes years to build and organise a large air fleet and to train the men, and we cannot mobilise our old pilots. Men quickly deteriorate when they have given up flying. Moreover, a good aviator remains at the height of his power for only a short time, and the rapid progress of construction and design causes old aviators to feel out of place in a new machine. It also takes years to organise chemical warfare on a large scale, as we found to our cost during the War. It is

ominous that we have neglected both aviation and the chemical industries. Our sailors and soldiers cannot possibly protect us against chemical attacks from the air. Their gallantry alone will not save us. Their weapons will be as futile as are the spears of savages against machine guns and repeating rifles.

Before the War, we had given some attention to the aeroplane, but had almost completely disregarded the airship. Germany was the only Power which had developed the airship. The soldiers and sailors when urged to provide them argued that (1) the airship was still in the experimental stage; (2) that it was of doubtful value; (3) that terrible accidents had occurred through its use in Germany; and (4) that it would be best to let other nations experiment and for England to benefit from their experience when a reliable type of airship had been evolved. All these arguments proved faulty. German Zeppelins did an enormous amount of harm to this country. The few airship raids which took place did far greater damage than all the numerous aeroplane raids. Further, the possession of airships proved of the greatest advantage to the German fleet. Air cruisers acted as the eyes of their navy, while the British fleet was blindfolded through the lack of airships. We had the greatest difficulty in locating and destroying raiders, such as the 'Emden,' and in locating and destroying U-boats and mines. A few airships could have done the work of hundreds of surface vessels. Feeling keenly the lack of airships, we strained our energies to provide them. We copied a Zeppelin which had been brought down, and the proved value of our airships created a general determination that henceforth Great Britain should be foremost in the air, not only with aeroplanes but also with airships. Unfortunately, we have abandoned airships for the sake of economy, and the airships of other nations may prove exceedingly dangerous to us in case of war, not only by acting as scouts, but also by dropping explosives and chemicals in quantities which have hitherto appeared fantastic.

During the War the German airships were no match for our aeroplanes, as our aviators, after a time, readily set them alight. In any forthcoming war, this may no longer be possible. The airships of the future will not

use the highly inflammable hydrogen, but helium, which is non-inflammable. Helium is a very expensive gas which occurs in the natural condition in the American oil-fields. The Americans, recognising the vast value of airships using non-inflammable helium, have arranged storage for helium sufficient for a considerable number of airships and are energetically building them with German assistance. It is not unlikely that helium may be produced in the oil regions of Canada, of Persia, and elsewhere. From what has been said it will be seen that not only with regard to aeroplanes, but also in respect to airships, this country has sunk to a low position in the world. It should especially be remembered that in the future no nation can dominate the sea unless it also dominates the air.

The military and naval value of aeroplanes and airships is already great. It seems certain, however, that we stand merely on the threshold of aerial development. The airship and the aeroplane of five years, ten years, or fifteen years hence, will probably stand in the same relation to the airship and the aeroplane of the present, as that in which the 18-inch naval gun does to the guns used by Nelson and by the men of the Armada. It must be remembered that the steamship, the railway, the motor-car, and many similar inventions, were for a long time considered of doubtful value, and that torpedoes and submarines were laughed at. The future development of the air weapon may surpass the wildest expectations of the most imaginative writers of fiction. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that Great Britain should be abreast of the times and as far advanced as any other nation in the production of airships and aeroplanes. The British people have an extraordinarily great talent for engineering. The steam engine and other machines without number were invented in this country. There is every chance of England occupying as high a position in the world in the building of airships and aeroplanes as she occupies in the building of merchant ships and warships; but progress in construction cannot be achieved if our Air Service is starved for money, and if other nations are allowed to remain ahead of this country in the number of machines constructed and maintained. After all, inventors are apt to take their discoveries to the largest and best market.

A powerful and well-equipped Air Service is not only indispensable to the security of our Motherland and Empire for the maintenance of the peace of the world, but it is a positive saving to the taxpayer. A small Air Force can do the work of a large land force, as well as of important naval squadrons. That has been the lesson of the war and of our post-war campaigns in Mesopotamia, India, and elsewhere. At the recent Air Conference at the Guildhall, Commander C. D. Burney stated, and Lord Gorell discussing his paper confirmed the assertion, that 16 airships could be produced for the cost of a single battleship and that 9 airships could do the work of 60 cruisers ; whereby 51,000,000*l.* might be saved. We were told at the same time that, per square mile of reconnaissance, airships would do for 1*l.* 5*s.* what it would cost 77*l.* to do with cruisers.

In the past, England dominated the sea and ensured the peace of the sea. Naval supremacy cannot exist without supremacy in the air. The advance of aviation has destroyed the security which this country enjoyed through its insular position. The peace of this country and the peace of the world are endangered by our weakness in the air, and Powers stronger in the air than ourselves must feel as much tempted to make use of their supremacy in this most potent weapon as Germany did in 1914, and as Napoleon did when he was at the height of his fame. Our lack of preparedness in the air may conceivably involve us—and the world—in another war which would devour countless millions of British money. Prevention is better than cure. Relatively small sums spent now on aviation may prove to be the truest economy, as true an economy as an additional 10,000,000*l.* or 20,000,000*l.* spent on military preparations would have been before that fatal year, 1914.

Military and civil aviation go hand in hand. It is true that military aeroplanes and aeroplanes used for civil purposes differ materially ; but men who can fly a civil machine can also fly a military machine. Civil flying is capable of providing us with a large body of able aviators, just as a prosperous merchant marine will provide us with a large body of able captains and seamen. The high development of civil aviation will not only furnish numbers of flying men who would

render invaluable service in the event of war, but would vastly strengthen aviation on the constructive side. Civil aviation is to military aviation what the Mercantile Marine is to the Navy, and just as our ablest builders of merchant ships can easily turn to the construction of warships, so the builders of peace aeroplanes without much difficulty can undertake the construction of war planes. At any rate, large and experienced staffs ready for the purpose of construction can thus be provided. The dispersal of these men, their absorption in other industries, and their emigration to other countries, has been a great calamity, not merely to our aeroplane industry and to aviation, but to the country as a whole. Though money might readily be provided at comparatively short notice, experienced staffs are the result of patient training during a large number of years.

Very important for an efficient military Air Force is the provision of well-placed hangars, repair depôts, etc. The construction and organisation of these requires a great deal of time, labour, and money. A highly developed civilian aviation service will automatically establish all these and training centres as well.

What the country really needs to-day is a National Air Force. This should be so developed that it renders aviation and Imperial Air Defence an integral part of the Nation's life—corresponding somewhat to the Territorials of our Army. This has already been recognised by our present Air Minister, and it is hoped that the forthcoming Imperial Conference will give consideration to the matter.

Before leaving the strategic aspect of aviation some consideration should be given to Military Defence generally and the increasingly important question of its future administration. There can be no doubt that military aviation has suffered, and is still suffering, from conflicts of policy and administration, as well as through the existence of competing authorities. Division creates dis-harmony and friction of every kind, thereby entailing weakness, inefficiency, and waste. The subject has been widely discussed since the days of the public inquiry into the administration and command of the Royal Flying Corps in 1915-16, when there was much jealousy and friction between the Royal Naval Air Service and the Royal

Flying Corps, culminating in their amalgamation into the present Royal Air Force. Recognising the disadvantages of divided authority and that unity is strength, Rear-Admiral M. F. Sueter, Sir Cecil Beck, Colonel Claude Lowther, and various others have recently proposed a Bill to subordinate the three fighting services to a Ministry of Defence.\* The Ministry of Defence Creation Bill was ordered to be printed on May 3, 1922. The explanatory memorandum states :

'(1) The Bill is to establish a Ministry of Defence consisting of a Principal Secretary of State, who shall be President of the Ministry of Defence, and an Under Secretary of State for each of the three departments: Admiralty, War Office, and Air Ministry respectively, for purposes connected with the development and maintenance of the three fighting services, viz. the Navy, Army, and Air Force, in an up-to-date and highly efficient condition, with the utmost economy, consonant with the increased efficiency which this Bill will effect, and for other purposes in connection therewith. . . .

'(4) The Ministry of Defence is responsible to His Majesty's Government for the proper consideration of all strategical and tactical questions bearing on the defence of the realm, i.e. on the surface of the water, under the water, on land, and in the air; for the proper equipment and maintenance of all arms of the three fighting services in a state of readiness and efficiency according to the principles of strategy and tactics adopted; to arrange for the provision and regulation of an adequate supply of personnel to all three fighting services; to examine the estimates which may be prepared by each of the services with a view to the co-ordination and reduction of unnecessary services and to maintain a balance as between one service and another in the expenditure required to carry out the general scheme of defence; and will be responsible to His Majesty's Government that the actual expenditure is the minimum that can attain this object.'

It is much to be hoped that the divisions which at present keep back the development of the air weapon and cause endless waste of effort and money will be abolished by the unification and centralisation of our defensive arrangements. The plan entails an eminently

---

\* So high an authority as Admiral Mark Kerr also favours unification of the three services under a single administration, as does Rear-Admiral A. P. Davidson, Major-General Sir John Davidson, and Major-General the Right Hon. J. Seely, M.P., amongst many others.

strong Minister of Defence with no predilections towards either of the older services on the one hand, or towards the Air Service on the other. He must be able to exercise good judgment as to the best scope for each of the services in National and Imperial interests. He would need to decide by which arm each particular function would most suitably be performed, due regard being given to the fact that aerial warfare must always be the cheapest, hence partly the German activity in aviation research. The whole matter involves very big questions, whilst providing, *inter alia*, an excellent field for economy in the services generally, as well as in administration.

Communication begets consolidation and co-operation, and the scattered nature of the British Commonwealth calls for the fullest and most efficient provision of communications. The development of Air Transport throughout the Empire would, for the purposes of Inter-Imperial communication, repay its cost times out of number. Apart from its obvious diplomatic and strategic value, such development, through its assistance to trade, would far more than balance the expenditure, as has already been recognised by most of the other great Powers.

The railway, the steamship, the telegraph, the telephone, and the motor-car have overcome distance. They have opened the interior of continents which a short time ago seemed inaccessible. They have brought nations within easy reach of one another. They have caused the rapid increase of the population of the modern world. Without the railway and the steamship, the population of the United States would still be confined to the sea border, and Canada and Australia would have only a few hundred thousand inhabitants. Every new method of communication and of transport was derided—or, at least, under-estimated—at the beginning. When railway construction began, experienced business men solemnly calculated that they could not possibly continue to work at a profit, because the trifling number of passengers and quantity of goods requiring transport could be carried far more cheaply by coaches, waggons, and barges. At the time when motor-cars were few and very dear, it was generally believed that they could only

be a toy of the idle rich. They were too expensive and unreliable to become a universal means of transport. The motor-bus is superseding the tramway. Horses are disappearing from the towns. In the United States there are 10,000,000 motor-cars—one for every two families. Millions of farmers and artisans there own motor-cars, and, in the opinion of Henry Ford and other Americans, the use of the motor-car has only begun.

Aeroplanes and airships still meet with the same scepticism as the motor-car and the motor-cycle met with not so long ago. Aviation is supposed by many to be of little practical utility, except for military purposes. Travelling by aeroplane is at present neither very comfortable nor very safe,\* and transport of goods by the same means is admittedly expensive; but those who view the future of flying with distrust have little imagination and faith. Flying machines are at present at much the same stage of development as was the motor-car when the driver was usually to be found underneath it on his back, trying to discover why it would not go. Although enormous progress has been made in the construction of flying machines, the advance hitherto effected will appear trifling a few years hence. It seems by no means unlikely that before long aviation will be greatly developed, and the use of flying machines as universal as that of motor-cars. Safety in the air has already become much improved. The cost of an aeroplane is far less than it was, and the time may come when even people of modest means can afford one. The practical use of flying machines is rapidly increasing. The American forest control is carried on largely by air. American land-owners and large farmers are finding it advantageous to use aeroplanes in their work. Exploration of difficult country, map making, etc., can most easily be carried on from the air. Formerly, it took weeks, or months, to pass through relatively short stretches of virgin forest and swamps. Instead of travelling on foot, axe in hand, explorers now can go by air. Throughout the Empire there are vast tracts of land sparsely populated, with natural resources calling out

\* Aeroplanes already promise, however, to become more comfortable, and, though still a somewhat noisy instrument of travel, the noise experienced is hardly worse than that met with on many a bad railway journey.

for development. Communication of all sorts should form an important factor for turning these vast tracts to the best possible account. But until aviation generally becomes cheaper and more comfortable, the use of flying machines will be mainly confined to carrying mails and such valuable goods as occupy little space. The aeroplane will, however, be turned to constantly increasing account for the purposes of State Diplomacy and for business interviews in distant countries, on account of the vast superiority of personal communications over those afforded by telegraphy or telephony.\* A personal interview is, in fact, the only satisfactory way of arriving at a conclusion in many instances, and time is often a highly essential element.

Economic prosperity depends largely upon communications. It is most important for business men to be in close and easy contact with their customers far away. We can best realise the supreme value of easy and rapid communication by imagining the breakdown of cables and of wireless telegraphy, or by imagining that, through a strike, our domestic telegraphs and telephones, or mails, should stop working. In certain cases, the telegraph is no longer the quickest or best method of rapid communication; in various instances it is being gradually superseded by the telephone and the aeroplane. After all, a long letter carried by aeroplane can be delivered over certain distances almost as quickly as a telegram, while a four-page aeroplane letter costs less than a short telegram.

Mail-carrying by air is particularly valuable over long distances, owing to the high speed of all aircraft compared with that of seagoing vessels.† Small towns and villages in the interior of sparsely populated countries have hitherto been almost out of touch with the world because of the great expenses associated with a regular mail delivery. By the air-way, mails can be rapidly and cheaply delivered and fetched from almost anywhere. The time is passing when colonists complain

\* *Inter-Imperial Communication by Cable, Wireless, and Air.* Address by the author to the British Association for the Advancement of Science. See also his 'Telegraphy, Aeronautics and War' (Constable).

† Incidentally, too, an aeroplane can travel now at more than double the speed of the fastest railway train.

that they have to ride thirty miles to the nearest Post Office, and the aeroplane will become a potent factor in the settlement of the empty spaces of the Empire.

In the oversea trade, communication by cable and wireless is of the greatest possible value for short messages, inquiries, orders, etc.; but the great bulk of oversea communications of a business nature goes by mail. Letters in long-distance traffic are distressingly slow. Postal communications between New York and London often take ten days; between London and India three or four weeks; between London and Australia five weeks or more. The line of transmission can be shortened to one-third and less by the development of the air-ways.

The superlative value—aye, the absolute necessity—of an official air-mail is obvious. The air-post is bound to be developed with energy by the more enterprising nations. In this matter it would be fatal to English business if we allowed ourselves to be overtaken by other countries. If, for instance, Germany should have an efficient air-mail, while this country was still relying on the ordinary mail, British business letters, price-lists, catalogues, and samples would reach customers in the oversea countries many days, or even weeks, after the receipt of the corresponding German communications. A vast amount of business would inevitably be transferred from England to Germany.

Not so long ago the motor-car was the rich man's toy. A few manufacturers employing small staffs, turned out a few luxury cars. Men generally believed that the motor-car was quite unimportant to trade and industry. The American motor-car business has become one of the most important industries of that great country. It absorbs millions of tons of steel every year, it uses 40 per cent. of the plate glass and 22 per cent. of the aluminium produced in the United States, besides consuming about two-thirds of the world's rubber output. It gives work to about three million people and has created numerous millionaires. The motor-car industry is, in fact, almost the most important industry of the United States. The time may come when the production of flying machines will be as important as that of motor-cars. At present, the United States produce nearly 90 per cent. of the world's motor-cars. Unless

England bestirs herself, America or some other country may monopolise the production of flying machines to the great injury of our workers and of the country as a whole.

Aviation is difficult and commercially of secondary importance within densely populated districts. It is easy and commercially indispensable in countries of long distances. The lands which seem to be destined to lead in aviation are the United States and the British Empire. The Americans, recognising the enormous importance of aviation, are developing it with the utmost energy. Aviation is, however, much more essential for the British Commonwealth than for the United States, because the distances which separate the different parts of our Empire are far greater than the distances to be bridged in the Republic. Thus, logically, the air-ways ought to be far more highly developed in the British Commonwealth than in the United States. The organisation of Imperial air-ways is as important as the Imperial cable system on the one hand and the Wireless Chain on the other.

At the third Air Conference, which was held on Feb. 7 and 8, the following resolution was passed :

'That in view of the necessity of increased rapidity of communication with the Empire, and in view of the progress made by other nations in civil aviation, this Conference calls upon the Government to give due and immediate consideration to the foundation of an air-mail throughout the Empire.'

Commander F. L. M. Boothby, the especially great authority on airships, concluded an inspiring article on 'The Importance of Airships,' which appeared in the 'Empire Review' for March 1923, with the following, very sensible, suggestion :

'What we now require is a new Committee on Empire Air Communications, excluding aeroplane enthusiasts and airship enthusiasts, but consisting of well-known engineers and business men, with open minds, who can report to a meeting of Empire representatives, so that this body can have facts before it, on which it can rely, to assist it in drawing up the scheme of Empire air communication. The stimulus for all this work should come from the Mother Country, but should she lack the enterprise it is hard to imagine any sphere of

activity in which one of the younger nations might so well take over the duties of the parent.'

It seems, indeed, absolutely necessary to organise civil aviation on an Imperial basis, and the Empire governments should agree without delay upon a scheme generously financed by all the Empire States. Its importance can scarcely be exaggerated. Its urgency is obvious. Happily, the necessity for such development is becoming more and more widely recognised. In February of this year a Report on Government Financial Assistance to Civil Air Transport Companies was published. A small committee consisting of Sir Herbert Hambling (Chairman), Sir Joseph Broodbank, and Mr Oliver J. G. Hoare had been asked by the terms of reference: 'To consider the present working of the scheme of Cross Channel Subsidies, and to advise on the best method of subsidising Cross Channel Air Transport in future, on the assumption that H.M. Government would be prepared to continue to make provision for this service at the rate of 200,000*l.* per annum for a further term of years—say three years.' That committee reported as follows under the heading 'Proposals for the Future':

'We have heard evidence from representatives of the Federation of British Industries and of the Association of British Chambers of Commerce and have assured ourselves that there is a very real desire in their own interests on the part of the commercial world, both manufacturers and merchants, to see efficient air transport services in operation between this country and the Continent, even at the cost of considerable subsidies from the Government, notwithstanding their strong views on the need for national economy. We have, for instance, had brought to our notice the desire of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce for quicker methods of transporting their samples, mails, and light goods abroad, which implies the maintenance of the Manchester-London service and the extension in the length of the services operated.

'We have been forced to recommend the creation of a new organisation as the solution of a difficult problem that is most likely to attain the end we have in view. . . . We consider that it would be impossible to bring such an organisation into existence on the security of subsidies granted only for the short periods of three or five years, and that a bolder policy of guaranteeing a total subsidy of a stated amount spread

over a period of 10 (ten) years, should be faced and, in our deliberate opinion, is the only sound policy that is likely to meet with success. . . .

'As an indication of the main lines of our proposals we suggest that the company should have a capital of 1,000,000*l.* (of which at first 500,000*l.* should be subscribed), with the right to the Government of nominating one or two directors, and the whole of the subscribed capital should have been guaranteed before the Government commence to subsidise the company. . . . The Government should guarantee a subsidy (spread over the period of ten years, but not in equal annual instalments) of such an amount as will enable a financial group to raise the share capital, and in our opinion such subsidy shall not be less than 1,000,000*l.*; conditions must be attached to the payment of the subsidy requiring the Company to perform services in connexion with the operation and development of commercial air transport.'

The recommendations of this small committee of business men are highly significant and very encouraging to all friends of aviation. It is of no use considering aviation development piecemeal. What is wanted is not the development of a few disconnected air-lines but a far-seeing, all-embracing, development of world air-lines and especially of Empire air-lines, with due provisions for both airships and aeroplanes, airships being required for long distances and continuous day and night journeys, whilst aeroplanes, providing the speediest of all methods of travel, are well adapted for short daytime distances.\*

The desire for strengthening the bonds of Empire and the bonds between ourselves and the United States is practically universal, as, also, is the desire for a better understanding between the English people and other nations. Great Britain and the Empire provinces, Great Britain and the United States, the English people and

\* Except with the few, the aeroplane is not at present a very practical proposition by night or for long distances, on the score either of safety or of comfort. Airships, on the other hand, can be navigated just as well by night as in broad daylight, and thick, or foggy, weather is a far less source of trouble than applies in the case of surface craft. A voyage by airship may not be as comfortable or pleasant as one on a sea-going vessel, but it is a great deal pleasanter than one in an aeroplane. Moreover, like a steamer, the large airship is open to a varied cargo—of passengers, mails, and goods—that renders its voyage a far more economic and practical affair than would be possible with an aeroplane even of large dimensions.

foreign nations, are kept apart by difficulties of communication. Cabling is expensive and letters travel slowly. The result is that we are insufficiently informed in the affairs of our Dominions—as also in those of the United States or other foreign countries—and our brothers over-sea complain of the inadequate way in which their views and needs are realised by the Mother-country as a whole. The intensive development of the air-ways would have the most potent influence in bringing together men who are now separated from each other by long distances. The development of aviation would serve to unite the Empire, would increase our intimacy with the United States, would improve our relations with foreign countries, would abolish those misunderstandings which at present exist between related and unrelated nations. From the political and social points of view, aviation can convey incalculable benefits to the Empire nations and to the nations of the world.

As stated at the beginning of this article, military and civil aviation are closely related. The development of the former in times of peace—or so-called peace—will be most powerfully advanced by the intensification of civil flying. By developing Imperial air-lines we lay the foundations for an impregnable system of defence. We provide for the Empire's security and peace, and we strengthen our influence among the nations, with the result that we shall be able to exercise a commanding influence in restraining aggressive nations and in preserving the peace of the world. We shall simultaneously promote prosperity and peace, improve inter-Imperial and international relations; while the neglect of aviation points to the impoverishment of our people and the dissolution of our Empire. It is fatal for a great nation to stand still in an age of progress such as ours. We have the choice between progress and prosperity or decline and downfall.

A naval fleet, however strong, is powerless unless it is adequately supported by flying machines of every type. A predominant air navy may destroy the strongest fleet in the world. In the past, the security of Great Britain and the Empire depended on our domination of the sea. Sea predominance is useless without air predominance. The air already promises to become our first line

of defence. Only those who live in the past demand that Great Britain should concentrate her energy upon the Navy. As much can be said without in any way belittling the great importance of our Fleet. Moreover, air defence is likely to become increasingly important with the advance of the science and art of aviation. For the latter purpose, aeronautical research in its widest sense is of the utmost importance. It is hoped, therefore, that as soon as funds permit, the Government will arrange for a fuller measure of encouragement in that direction—by a somewhat increased grant—seeing that any future wars seem likely to be largely based on scientific research.

In the event of a Ministry of Defence being, in due course, established it is quite on the cards that Civil Aviation and Aeronautical Research may be embraced either under a revived Ministry of Transport or possibly under either the Board of Trade or the Post Office. Meanwhile, it can certainly be stated that the Department under the especially business-like administration of Sir Samuel Hoare and, on the other hand, of Sir Sefton Brancker, the eminently worthy successor to Sir Frederick Sykes, forms a good example of the recognition by the present Government of the great importance of aviation. Further recognition is needed, however, by the Air Minister becoming a member of the Cabinet equally with the First Lord of the Admiralty and War Minister.\* So far, however, our Air Ministers have been a sort of Cinderella. It is good that so able an ex-Air Minister as Lord Weir has recently become a member of the Committee of Imperial Defence, but that is not enough.

The increasing activities of the Air League of the British Empire will, it is to be hoped, mean that no Government will ever be allowed to lapse into the neglect of aviation that had scandalously prevailed—even allowing for due economy—before the present administration came into power. Thus, in the interests of National and Imperial Defence and of Trade, the Air League should receive a still further measure of support from every British citizen worthy of the name.

CHARLES BRIGHT.

---

\* It is a source of much satisfaction that since these lines were written the Secretary of State for Air has become a Cabinet Minister.

## Art. 6.—PROBLEMS OF ACCLIMATISATION.

1. *The Naturalisation of Animals and Plants in New Zealand.* By the Hon. G. M. Thomson. Cambridge University Press, 1922.
2. *Report on the Damage done by Deer in the Forests and Plantations in New Zealand. State Paper.* Wellington.

NEW ZEALAND, being a group of islands separated by a thousand miles of ocean from any other extensive land area, has long been a fascinating field of research to the student of biology, especially for the light which an investigation of its flora and fauna throws upon the problems of evolution.

When Captain Cook landed in New Zealand in 1769, there were only four land mammals to be found in the country—a small native rat, a dog, supposed to have been introduced by the Maoris, and two species of bats. But its rich virgin forests—tropical in their luxuriance and beauty—abounded with bird-life, including many types not to be found in any other part of the world. These have been an unfailing source of interest to the biologists, as have also the insects, earthworms, and reptiles, particularly the fearsome-looking tuatara, supposed to be the oldest form of life surviving from ancient times on this planet. To the botanist, particularly the plant ecologist, the plant-life of New Zealand is equally rich in the opportunities offered for fruitful research. With the advent of a European population, however, the aspect of the country, from a naturalist's point of view, has become entirely changed, save only in a few remote districts, difficult of access, and even those are gradually coming under the influence of an alien invasion. The beautiful forests were destroyed in the most reckless fashion to make room for the farms of the settlers. Magnificent timber trees, which would now be worth in the aggregate several millions of pounds, were deliberately burned so that grass seed could be sown in the ashes. With the trees went, of course, the birds which fed on the berries or the honey-producing flowers.

But it was not only by direct destruction of this kind that the white man has altered the face of nature in New Zealand. Some of the efforts he made, with the

best intentions in the world, to supplement the animal and vegetable resources of his own home, have proved as disastrous as the process of creating a wilderness of blackened stumps and calling it settlement. One illustration only need be cited. Some of the early settlers, inspired, no doubt, by memories of the boyish delights of ferreting and shooting rabbits, introduced a few pairs of rabbits into the colony, and turned them loose. The results have been appalling, especially in parts of the South Island. The rabbits increased at an incredible rate, and at one time it looked as if sheep-farming, the chief industry of the country, had been made impossible. In the 'seventies and early 'eighties the pest had overrun the greater part of Otago, as well as the whole of Southland. The fine natural grasses on which sheep and cattle grazed were almost totally destroyed. Not only did four rabbits eat as much as one sheep—according to the most moderate computation—but the fouling of the land spoiled it for grazing or stock of any kind. Sheep perished from starvation by hundreds of thousands, and the majority of the squatters were ruined. I remember seeing an advertisement in the 'Government Gazette' offering 100,000 acres of grazing country for a merely nominal rental of ten or twelve pounds a year. The explanation, of course, was that the cost of keeping down the rabbits, if it could be accomplished at all, would have amounted practically to a prohibitive rental in itself. When the true nature of the pest became manifest the most frantic efforts were made to cope with it. In the early days, hunting with dogs, shooting, digging out the warrens, poisoning with various baits and trapping were the methods adopted. Later, wire netting fencing, the introduction of stoats, weasels, and ferrets, fumigating the burrows with poisonous gases—such as carbon disulphide and hydrocyanic acid—and the stimulus given to trapping by the export trade in frozen rabbits and rabbit skins were relied upon. At one time proposals were made to introduce disease among the swarming millions to bring about their extermination; but nothing was done in this direction.

It was not until 1895 that any check was observable, but from that time there has been a steady diminution, and it may now fairly be said that the plague is stayed,

although owners of land have to be continually on the watch, and find it necessary to expend large sums of money annually to prevent these prolific animals from again getting the mastery. During the War, when the best rabbit skins fetched as much as 3s. 10d. per skin—doubtless for the manufacture of 'coney seal' coats for munition workers—it looked almost as if the curse were about to be turned into a blessing. The chief profit was made, however, not by the owners, but by the rabbiters. Labour was scarce—most of the young New Zealand countrymen who were able-bodied had gone to the front—and mere boys earned as much as 25*l.* per week at rabbiting. The price has since gone back to about 8*d.* per skin. In 1921 the value of rabbit skins exported was only 448,180*l.*, while the economic waste caused by the rabbits, according to Mr Thomson, probably runs every year into millions of pounds. Trapping is not much thought of by practical farmers as a means of keeping down the pest. The trappers catch rabbits as long as it pays them to do so, but take care to leave a nucleus for future operations. Some authorities think that the decline of the rabbit is principally due to natural causes. Mr Begg, of Mosgiel, quoted by Mr Thomson, says :

'Hardly two men will agree as to the cause of the decline in the rabbit, and I will just state my theory for what it is worth. The grey rabbit, when first introduced, found himself in very congenial surroundings. There was abundance of food and shelter, and the ground was absolutely clean, never having been grazed by rabbits previously. These favourable conditions gave a tremendous fillip to the vitality of the rabbits and stimulated their powers of reproduction. They increased at a rate that I believe is not even approached in the worst infested parts of Otago to-day. No efforts at checking them had the slightest effect, and they passed over the country like a prairie fire. After a time the original conditions no longer existed. Food became scarce, the land was foul with rabbits, disease appeared among them, and their fertility decreased. No doubt improved methods of dealing with them hastened their reduction, but I firmly believe that the principal factor in their decrease was lessened fertility, due to the first great spurt to their vitality having spent itself.'

It is hardly possible to doubt that the strenuous

efforts of the landowners—stimulated by penalties imposed by law for failure to keep down rabbits—have had considerable effect. The subdivision of large estates into smaller holdings, which has been a marked feature of land settlement in New Zealand during the last few years, has been beneficial from the point of view of coping with the rabbit, as in other respects. Mr Begg, who is disposed to put in a good word even for that ‘puir deil,’ says: ‘Many a successful farmer of to-day got a start as a rabbiter. The killing of rabbits actually became one of the principal industries of the province. Their presence directly led to the subdivision of large estates, and may have been quite as effective as all the legislation on the subject.’

If, however, you once interfere with the balance of Nature there is no saying where the effect will end. The introduction of rabbits, as Mr Thomson points out, has had a lasting effect on acclimatisation generally :

‘Before their advent partridges and pheasants had become numerous, but they have entirely disappeared in Otago. In the effort to cope with the rabbits the country was annually sown with poisoned grain. This had a disastrous effect both on native and imported game. Had rabbits not become a nuisance it is unlikely that weasels and other vermin would have been introduced. These animals are largely responsible for the decrease in the number of native birds, and also make the successful introduction of new varieties more difficult.’

In an eloquent passage Mr Thomson describes the sentiments which led those who settled in New Zealand from time to time to set about introducing into their new homes plants and animals associated with the home from which they came :

‘The early settlers of New Zealand found themselves in a land which, as far as regards climate and natural conditions, seemed to them to reproduce many of the best features of the homeland from which they came. They thought with affection and with the glamour of youthful remembrance of the lakes and rivers, the woods and the fields, the hills and the dells of that homeland. They recalled the sport which was forbidden to all but a favoured few, but which they had often longed to share in—the game preserves, the deer on the mountains or in the parks, the grouse on the heather-clad

hills, the pheasants in the copses and plantations, the hares and partridges in the stubbles and turnip fields, the rabbits in the hedgerows and sandy warrens, and the salmon of forbidden price in their rivers—and there rose up before their vision a land where all these desirable things might be found and enjoyed. Their thoughts went back to the days when they guddled the spotted trout from under the stones of the burns and brooks, to the song-birds which charmed their youthful ears, to the flowers and trees which delighted the eye. They recalled the pleasant memories of hours passed on the hills and in the woods of their beloved native land. Here, in a land of plenty, with few wild animals, few flowers apparently, and no associations, with streams almost destitute of fish, with shy song-birds, and few game-birds, and certainly no quadrupeds but lizards, it seemed to them that it only wanted the best of the plants and animals associated with these earlier memories to make it a terrestrial paradise. So, with zeal unfettered by scientific knowledge, they proceeded to endeavour to introduce as far as possible the best remembered and most cherished features of the country from which they came. No doubt some utilitarian ideas were mingled with those of romance and sentiment, but the latter were in the ascendant.'

In the opinion of Mr Thomson, who it may be stated is an accomplished naturalist and close observer, the result of acclimatisation work in New Zealand has on the whole been disastrous :

'In time some of the plants and animals which had been introduced not only established themselves securely, but increased at a rate which upset all calculations. Conditions were produced which had never been anticipated, and the introductions became dangerous and expensive pests. Then public measures had to be taken to check the newcomers, and in some cases their natural enemies had to be introduced. This has led to further complication and unexpected results. These natural enemies, like the things they were meant to check, did not always do what was expected of them; they frequently failed to achieve the purpose for which they were introduced, and took to destroying things which it was desirable should be preserved. Legislation had to be resorted to in order to destroy some introduced things and to protect others. Noxious Weeds Acts, Animal Protection Acts, Injurious Birds Acts, and so on, have been passed into law, together with countless Regulations and Orders in Council dealing with the same subject in its multifarious aspects. By

way of commentary and satire on the whole business, the Government itself is in many cases the chief offender against the laws of its own making.'

The whole history of acclimatisation in New Zealand abounds in 'bungles and blunders,' and while a certain amount of good has been done, notably in stocking the nearly empty rivers and lakes with fine fishes for food and sport, the record of harm done is immeasurably greater.

If there is one achievement in the history of acclimatisation in New Zealand on which the people have been accustomed to pride themselves it was the successful establishment of deer for the purposes of sport. There is no doubt that from the point of view of the sportsman it has been a complete success. Visitors from Great Britain were delighted to find that for a licence fee of two pounds they were able to indulge in deerstalking equal to any in the world, the only other expense being those incidental to living in camp, amid some of the finest mountain scenery in the Dominion, and paying a pound or thirty shillings a day to a guide who would attend to the cooking and do the rough work of the camp. The entire cost, including fare to and from the Dominion, and hotel charges in the bargain, came to less than the expenses of a season's stalking in the Highlands. But what was sport to the tourist in quest of 'heads,' has proved disaster to the runholder and farmer. The deer have multiplied to such an extent that the devastation they cause is second only to that wrought by the rabbits, and their extermination over large tracts of country where at present they roam is being seriously advocated.

It is to the credit of the present Government that they have become alive to the criminal folly of allowing the destruction of native forest to continue; and a State Forestry Act having been passed, a State Forest Service was established in 1920 with a highly capable Director of Forestry at its head. The object is to maintain existing forests, and to carry out a certain amount of afforestation, both on the lines suggested by the best modern experience. Almost as soon as the Department began operations it became evident that if the forests were to be preserved the deer would have to be kept out of them.

A Report on the subject prepared by Mr A. D. Perham, Forest Assistant, and presented to Parliament, gives an interesting résumé of the facts connected with the introduction of deer into the Dominion, and prefers a most serious indictment against those animals on account of the damage they are doing, not only to forests, but to the grazing industry and to agriculture in general.

It appears from this document that there are some ten species of deer naturalised in New Zealand; but the herds of two only—red and fallow—have assumed proportions of any magnitude. They were introduced for sporting purposes; importations of some 111 head, spread over the years 1861 to 1909, were made. They were released on land then thought valueless, some of which has later become of value to the national interests. They have increased enormously—probably to some 300,000 head—and have spread over large areas of country. As regards the injury done to forests, Mr Perham states that in places where the herds are big, and food in short supply, all undergrowth is eaten out as high as the animals can reach, saplings are ring-barked, and reforestation is at a standstill. Where the protecting undergrowth is destroyed destruction of the forest is only a question of time. Photographs accompanying the Report show the damage done by the deer and afford convincing, and at the same time depressing, evidence of the reality of the evil. As to the damage done to farming interests, it is stated that in one district in Southland, bordering on the National Park, where deer are numerous, it is becoming practically impossible to grow crops. Grain crops are grazed on, trampled down, and even when in stalk are not immune, the sheaves being tossed in all directions and destroyed. Turnip crops are grazed, often before they are ready, and in some cases rows are pulled up in a spirit of mischief and left to rot. Farmers state that their losses among ewes and lambs through deer playing about among them at lambing time are considerable. One farmer estimated his reduction in lambs at 30 per cent. Loss through the displacement of stock is costing the Dominion thousands of pounds annually. One instance is given of a settler who had to abandon a grazing run of 23,000 acres at Lake Rotoiti, Nelson,

because the place was overrun with deer, leaving no feed for stock. A lady settler informed the Department that she used to shear 10,000 sheep off her run, and carry 100 head of cattle. Owing to the deer she was able to shear only 4500 sheep last year, and cannot now graze any cattle. The writer of the Report, working on the conservative basis that one deer displaces one and a half sheep, estimates a total loss of 180,000*l.* per annum from this cause. The damage to forests, he says, is impossible to assess in terms of cash. Unless the animals are strictly controlled, the forests will in time be destroyed.

What is there to be set on the credit side? Very little, according to this unsparing critic. The actual returns from shooting licences average 1393*l.* per annum. The money spent in reaching the grounds and paying guides, Mr Perham places at treble the cost of the licences, namely, 4179*l.* The number of oversea visitors attracted to the Dominion by the sport, he says, is very small, and he considers that in placing this attraction at the same value as the shooting licences (1398*l.* per annum) he is making a fair estimate. He thus arrives at a total of 7000*l.* per annum to be credited to the deer as against 'a debit to the national interests' of 180,000*l.* per annum.

Looking at the matter from an impartial point of view, it would seem that the expert, in his natural indignation at the destruction wrought in the forests which are his especial care, has under-estimated the value of the deer to the country. But it further appears that from the sporting point of view the herds, with the increase in numbers, are degenerating in quality. According to the Report already cited several factors contribute to the deterioration in some of the large herds :

'Firstly, deer have been introduced into a country where there is an absence of natural enemies—strong and weak alike are able to live—the law of the "survival of the fittest" does not apply. In fact, the reverse is the case—the strongest and best developed stags are those shot—and, excepting in cases where rigorous culling is carried out, it is the weaker stags which head the herds, which must sooner or later reflect on the standard of the whole herd. Inbreeding has no doubt contributed largely; but by far the greatest factor

is that resulting from over-stocking, with its consequent loss of food supply. It is a well-known fact that the best heads are always obtained where there is most feed.'

The recommendations contained in the Report are sufficiently drastic : (1) On settlement land or land contiguous to settlement, the protection of deer should be wholly removed, and the carcasses and hides of deer killed should be allowed to be marketed. At present this is against the law. (2) On the more remote land, pastoral country, forested lands, etc., either men should be employed to shoot off the deer or poisoning is suggested where this can be done without damage to other stock. It is significantly added : 'This has already been tried with some success, surreptitiously, of course ; the bait being apples and carrots poisoned with strychnine.'

The Government has been so far impressed by this Report that protection has at once been removed to the extent that any one is now empowered, without a licence, to shoot deer found doing damage on his own property. Furthermore, a conference is to be held with representatives of the acclimatisation societies and other interests concerned to decide what further steps shall be taken to deal with the menace.

Other efforts to provide game for sportsmen have not been successful. Repeated attempts have been made to introduce pheasants, but although these seemed for a time to succeed, the birds gradually died off, and the provincial district of Auckland is now the only place where it is possible to get pheasant-shooting in the season, and that only on a small scale. Californian quail are fairly plentiful in Auckland, Nelson, and elsewhere. But the attempts to introduce partridges Mr Thomson describes as 'almost pathetic' ; he is not aware of any district in New Zealand where partridges have survived. Some misguided enthusiasts even went so far as to import the red-legged variety (*Caccabis rufa*), but with no greater success. The causes of the total disappearance of the partridges, Mr Thomson thinks, may be the same as in the case of the pheasants, viz. poison (laid for rabbits), wekas (native ground birds which are said to kill even ferrets), and the great abundance of introduced insect-eating birds, which have destroyed the

grasshoppers and other natural food of pheasants and partridges.

The desire of the early colonists to have around them the familiar song-birds of Britain—such as blackbirds, thrushes, and skylarks—met with too much success. These birds abound in countless thousands, and are regarded by orchardists and farmers as responsible for much damage to their crops. It is sad to learn that, next to the sparrow, the skylark is considered by farmers to be the most baneful of the small birds which have been introduced. They are particularly destructive in spring, when they pull wheat and other grains out of the ground just as they are springing. They also uproot seedling cabbages, turnips, and other farm plants. In the Foxton district pea-growing is quite impossible owing to their depredations. Not the least of the damage done by introduced British birds is through the way in which they distribute the seeds of the blackberry—another introduction which has proved a curse, ruining thousands of acres of good land. Sparrows were introduced with the idea of coping with the native caterpillars which were very destructive. It is believed that it was intended to import the harmless hedge-sparrow, and that the impudent house-sparrow found his way here through a mistake in identity. However that may be, he is now regarded everywhere as a pest, and nearly every county council and agricultural association in New Zealand wages war on him by selling poison to farmers and offering bonuses for eggs. In fairness it should be added that while it is easy for the present generation to see and appraise the damage done to crops by imported British birds, only the older colonists remember the extraordinary prevalence in the early days of caterpillars, grasshoppers, and other insect pests, and there is no doubt that the introduced birds are to be credited with their disappearance.

If some of the harmful insects native to the country have been exterminated or brought under control, there have been several immigrants equally, if not more, objectionable to take their places. The flesh-fly and the common house-fly are now so numerous that a 'Swat the Fly' campaign is sedulously advocated as part of the propaganda work carried on by the Government Health

Department. The early settlers had an idea that the common house-fly (*Musca domestica*), then newly arrived in the colony, drove out the native blow-fly, which not only 'blew' their mutton, but actually deposited its eggs in their blankets. It is said that in the infant days of the Canterbury settlement the squatters when they came in to the Christchurch Club were to be seen catching all the house-flies they could find and placing them in bottles, with the view of liberating them in their up-country dwellings. Apparently they were only saddling themselves with another pest. The late Captain Hutton, one of New Zealand's most distinguished men of science, dealing with this idea in 1901, said: 'The statement that the introduced house-fly has displaced the native blow-flies, which have practically disappeared, is quite erroneous. I doubt whether they compete in any way.'

Nearly all common weeds known in England have been introduced into New Zealand, in most cases by accident, mixed with agricultural seeds. But some plants not regarded as particularly harmful in England have become so in their new environment. Among these may be mentioned gorse and watercress. The former is proclaimed, under Act of Parliament, a 'noxious weed,' and settlers are compelled by law to keep it in check. Of the watercress it is said that when first introduced into Canterbury it grew to as much as 'fourteen feet in length, and stout in proportion.' It blocked the river Avon, and the streams running into it, so that hundreds of pounds had to be spent annually in attempting to keep the watercourses clear. It is reassuring to learn that its exuberant habits have received a check, and that the size is now normal. The schedules of the Noxious Weeds Act also include the following—all introduced: Sweetbriar, broom, blackberry, dock, ox-eye daisy, thistles, fennel, pennyroyal, St John's wort, elderberry, and foxglove.

Whether the Scottish thistle was originally introduced by a Scotsman from sentimental and patriotic reasons is not known; there is no more anxiety to claim to be the origin of our woes in this respect than there is to pose as the would-be benefactor who first introduced the rabbit or the sparrow. There are considerable

stretches of Scottish heather growing on the pumice plains of the North Island, but, strange to say, the names of those who are credited with having scattered the seed have a decidedly Hibernian look. A late Commissioner of Police planted large numbers of heather plants in the Tongariro National Park, in anticipation of the grouse which he hoped to see liberated there. It is sad to learn that this action brought forth a strong protest from the Director of Forestry.

The introduction of fruit trees and fruit into the Dominion has also brought in a host of new insect pests, to say nothing of fungoid and bacterial diseases, to plague the lives of the fruit-growers. Men of science are now at work endeavouring to find the natural enemies of some of these pests. For example, Dr Tillyard, the well-known entomologist attached to the Cawthron Institute, Nelson, has had very successful results in setting a minute wasp, known as *Aphelinus mali*, to exterminate the woolly aphis (American blight) on apples. It is characteristic of the careful methods now adopted in these matters that these tiny insects, before liberation, were carefully examined to see if they carried any parasites, that such parasites were discovered, and promptly destroyed. An imported ladybird has practically exterminated another apple pest, 'cottony cushion scale,' and experts of the Agricultural Department are now hoping, with the help of the Entomological Institute, to find a natural enemy for the pear midge, which has made its appearance in the Dominion within the last four or five years. The most recent tribulation of the New Zealand orchardist is the discovery that the dreaded 'fireblight' of America (*Bacillus amylovorus*), a very destructive bacterial disease, has made its appearance. Energetic steps are being taken to cut it out wherever it appears, and in some commercial orchard districts orders have been issued to root out all hawthorn hedges—another introduction from the Homeland—as it is known that these are means of carrying over the infection during the winter.

Really the only department of acclimatisation in New Zealand which seems free from destructive criticism is, as Mr Thomson points out, the work done in the introduction of food fishes. The naturalisation of the brown

trout (*Salmo fario*) Mr Thomson truly says is the most successful piece of acclimatisation work undertaken in this country. 'It has exceeded all expectations. It has not only stocked the streams and rivers with the finest of sporting and edible fishes, a reputation which it shares with the rainbow trout; but it has brought numerous sportsmen to the country, and made it known far and wide as a paradise for anglers.' English fishermen find it difficult to believe the size to which brown trout attain in New Zealand. Mr Thomson gives authorities to show that the largest brown trout taken from Rotorua lake was 27½ lbs., while the largest from Lake Taupo is stated at 29 lbs. The quantity of trout (chiefly rainbow) in these two lakes is almost incredible. They had indeed become overstocked, and as the fishing was deteriorating in consequence, the Government took the matter in hand and proceeded to reduce the number by netting. In three years they took out 213,467 fish, weighing 232½ tons, and the result was to improve the quality of the fishing.

Another valuable fish which has become very firmly established and is affording good sport to anglers, is the quinnat salmon (*Salmo quinnat*). This year the Inspector of Fisheries is also able to announce with pardonable pride that the still finer Atlantic salmon has been successfully established after numerous unsuccessful attempts, beginning in 1864, have been made to acclimatise this fish. Reference should also be made to the work being carried on at the Portobello (Dunedin) Marine Fish Hatchery, under the supervision of Mr Thomson, for the purpose of introducing into New Zealand waters lobsters and crabs, as well as turbot, herrings, and other food fishes from the seas of the Northern Hemisphere. The task is full of difficulties, and it is too early to say what measure of success is likely to be achieved. Mr Thomson is pessimistic about the herring, but is hopeful as to the chances of the crustacea.

Enough has been said to show that—in all new countries, at any rate—the work of acclimatisation should be strictly controlled by the State, acting under the best expert guidance. In New Zealand the work carried on by the acclimatisation societies has been the

result of enthusiasm without sufficient scientific knowledge to keep their activities within safe bounds. 'I have been on the Council of an acclimatisation Society,' says Mr Thomson, 'and I know the enthusiasm, unalloyed by scientific considerations, which animates the members.' It is only a few months since one acclimatisation society passed a resolution to liberate opossums—notorious for their love of fruit—on a range of hills contiguous to the largest block of commercial orchards in the Dominion. Fortunately the Government intervened in time to prevent this folly. The Department of Agriculture has inspectors at every port who examine importations of fruit and plants with the object of preventing the introduction of pests and diseases. Yet in spite of care the dreaded fireblight escaped them, and outbreaks were reported almost simultaneously in several parts of the North Island. Dr Tillyard urges in the strongest manner that a plant quarantine station shall be established, and that no plants or bulbs shall be allowed to be imported until they have been scientifically examined and reported free from danger.

New Zealand has suffered many things from those well-meaning persons who sought to add to its flora and fauna by introductions from outside, but it has been mercifully spared one calamity. It is still a country without snakes, notwithstanding that the nearest continent, Australia, has them in abundance, including some of the most venomous.

W. H. TRIGGS.

### Art. 7.—GERMANY'S CAPACITY TO PAY.

BEFORE the war, German statesmen and publicists endeavoured to show that their country was by far the wealthiest in Europe. Germans, of every class, are now proclaiming that their country has been utterly ruined by the war and is unable to pay adequate reparations. The solution of the Reparation problem is of the utmost importance to this country and the peace of the world. By destroying the value of the mark, Germany has wiped out not only her national debt but also the private indebtedness of her industries. German competition was serious before the war. It will be infinitely more dangerous to us if British industry is shackled and weighed down with an onerous war burden, while Germany is free of her war debt and her peace debts as well. Besides, France is determined that Germany shall make good the damage she has done; that if a nation is to be ruined by the war, it shall not be France. England is obviously interested in Germany paying for reparations to the limit of her capacity. What, then, is German capacity in that respect? Is it true that she has been ruined by the Treaty of Versailles and the reparation payments made hitherto?

In 1914 Germany had become the richest country in Europe owing to her favourable geographical position and her great physical and human resources. These have been reduced only to a slight extent by the peace. She occupies the centre of the Continent. She is the natural mart and exchange of the countries around her. The greater part of Germany consists of an exceedingly fertile plain, opened up by a number of deep, gently flowing, and easily navigable streams, which form a system unique in the world. Her great rivers are navigable almost throughout the year by ships and barges carrying 1000 tons of goods and more, and are easily connected by lateral canals. The harbours of the Eastern Baltic are closed during many months of the year by ice, while the countries to the south and west of Germany lack easy access to the sea. Hence, a large portion of the trade of Western Russia, of the Scandinavian countries, of the Danubian lands, of Switzerland, Northern Italy and Western France, is carried via Germany. The most

important harbour of Austria-Hungary was Hamburg, not Trieste. The commercial importance of Germany is bound to increase with the improvement of her river and canal system. Deep new waterways connecting the Rhine with the Elbe, the Danube, and other rivers have been planned.

Agricultural Germany is highly productive. Before the war, she produced ten times as much breadcorn as this country, six times as much potatoes, twice as much meat, and, in addition to comparable items, produced twice as much sugar as she required, huge quantities of tobacco, and an abundance of timber and firewood. She has lost only a relatively unimportant proportion of her agricultural soil. The recent advance of agricultural science and of chemistry has caused leading German experts to proclaim that she will be able to raise within her borders all the food she requires, although her population is almost as dense as that of this country.

The bulk of Germany's pre-war wealth was created by her manufacturing industries. Her industrial advance was due to the possession of an abundance of the most important raw materials, to cheap transport, to an excellent geographical position, and to the industry and energy of a numerous and rapidly increasing population. The bulk of these assets has remained to Germany. The most important industrial raw material is coal. It is true that Germany has lost a large part of her coal-bearing lands. She remains, however, the richest in that commodity among the nations of Europe. According to German official publications, the present coal wealth of the principal European nations is as follows:

Germany . . . .	235,000,000,000	tons.
Poland . . . .	208,000,000,000	"
United Kingdom . . . .	189,000,000,000	"
European Russia . . . .	57,000,000,000	"
France . . . .	31,000,000,000	"
Belgium . . . .	11,000,000,000	"
Holland . . . .	4,000,000,000	"
Other countries . . . .	78,000,000,000	"

Germany has far more coal than Great Britain and France combined, and in addition has gigantic lignite deposits. At present she produces more than 10,000,000

tons of lignite per month. Her coal is of excellent quality and occurs in thick and easily accessible seams, and every few weeks one hears of new discoveries of coal and lignite. The rivers in the south can provide millions of hydro-electrical horse-power. As regards the possession of cheap and abundant power, the most important factor in industrial success, Germany remains foremost in Europe.

Germany has lost the bulk of her iron ore in Alsace Lorraine and the bulk of her tin ore in Upper Silesia. Also, she has lost to France a considerable quantity of her potash deposits. Her wealth, however, in potash and other salts is absolutely unfathomable. It appears that the greater part of Germany stands on a bed of potash and other salts, which in some districts is thousands of feet thick. The loss of the Lorraine iron ores is not so serious. Before the war, Germany relied to an ever-increasing extent on imported iron ores richer in metallic iron than her native ores. In 1913 she imported, on balance, 11,400,000 tons of high-grade iron ore from Sweden, Spain, France, Algeria, Newfoundland, and elsewhere. Foreign iron ore can be carried by water to the great coal-fields where it is smelted and worked-up. There is also no difficulty in obtaining zinc ore from abroad. Inland transport was very cheap in Germany to the great advantage of her industries, partly because of the possession of the excellent waterways previously described, partly because railway construction and transport were cheap in a country which is generally level ground. Between Cologne and the eastern frontier of Germany, there is not a single tunnel or important railway cutting or embankment. Inland transport is likely to be cheapened further by the improvement of waterways and railways, now being energetically promoted, by electrification, etc.

Before the war, Germany produced twice as much iron and steel as this country, and consumed far more copper. She was well ahead of Great Britain in industrial production, except in the textile industries and shipbuilding. By linking up her great coal and iron combines with the shipyards, Germany hopes to double and treble her pre-war output of ships, and she has vastly increased her industrial outfit, for during and after the

war the bulk of the profits made in commerce and industry was applied to extending and improving her plant; while in this country the bulk of the profits has been claimed by the tax collector. German factories are therefore in efficiency far ahead of the British. They have been modernised, mainly since the Armistice; while British factories are partly ill-planned and are full of antiquated labour-wasting machinery.

Germany possesses not only the most favourable geographical position and the most valuable physical resources among the nations of Europe, but has, in addition, a large, intelligent, industrious, progressive, and rapidly increasing population. The Germans have shown in the past their high ability for carrying on commerce, shipping, banking, agriculture, and the manufacturing industries, particularly in those branches that yield the largest profits. In consequence, Germany has advanced in the past more rapidly than other nations. A few decades ago, the country was poor and the people lived mainly by agriculture. Before the war, Germany had become the leading nation in Europe in many industries, and the leading nation in the world in certain highly important and most profitable industries, such as the chemical industry and the electrical industry. France and other countries have seen their valuable territories devastated by the war; while England has suffered from almost unbearable taxation. Germany has neither endured invasion nor suffered from ruinously high taxes during or after the war. She has preserved the bulk of her wealth-creating resources and has vastly enlarged and improved her wealth-creating machinery. Why, then, has she been reduced to poverty? Why is she not only unable to pay reparations but unable even to raise sufficient taxes for her current needs?

Her poverty is rather apparent than real. It is due to a variety of causes, among which inflation, perhaps, stands foremost. The progress of inflation will be seen from the following table of Reichsbank notes in circulation:

Dec. 31, 1913 . . . .	2,593,000,000 marks.
" 1914 . . . .	5,045,000,000 "
" 1915 . . . .	6,918,000,000 "

## GERMANY'S CAPACITY TO PAY 111

Dec. 31, 1916 . . . . .	8,055,000,600 marks.
" 1917 . . . . .	11,468,000,000 "
" 1918 . . . . .	22,188,000,000 "
" 1919 . . . . .	35,698,000,000 "
" 1920 . . . . .	68,805,000,000 "
" 1921 . . . . .	113,689,000,000 "
" 1922 . . . . .	1,280,095,000,000 "
May 31, 1923 . . . . .	8,563,749,000,000 "

It will be noticed that the printing of notes has progressed with ever-growing rapidity. During the war the quantity in circulation was increased about eight-fold. Since the Armistice the notes in circulation have increased several hundredfold. We cannot wonder that the mark, worth a shilling before the war and about sixpence at the time of the Armistice, has fallen to an extremely small fraction of a penny.

The wealth of nations is habitually estimated in terms of money. Hence many people are under the illusion that money is wealth. Taking advantage of this misconception, many Germans endeavour to prove that their country is ruined by comparing the present value of the mark with its pre-war value. The wealth of nations does not consist of money, which is merely a simulacrum of wealth. It consists exclusively of real values, such as land, houses, machinery, railways, and so forth. While Germany has lost part of her real wealth by territorial cessions, and the portion ceded was relatively unimportant, the machinery of production and of commerce within present-day Germany has improved vastly since 1914.

The collapse of the mark has not impoverished Germany as a nation. It has ruined certain classes and greatly enriched others. A farmer who passed sleepless nights because there was a mortgage of M.50,000 on his farm which was worth 2,500*l.*, can now repay that mortgage by selling a couple of fowls. His indebtedness has been practically wiped out. What the mortgagor has lost the farmer has won. A manufacturer of clothing can repay a pre-war loan of a million marks by selling a few yards of cloth or an inferior sewing-machine or some other trifle. The holders of mortgages on land and houses, of Government stock, of debentures, pre-

ference shares, and other fixed interest-bearing securities, have been utterly ruined. Their wealth has been transferred to industry, commerce, and agriculture. Before the war, the great German banks held the industries in the hollow of their hands, for the manufacturers owed untold millions to the banks. The banks have suffered like the great body of investors. Industry and agriculture have benefited enormously by the collapse of the mark. Nevertheless, the greatly enriched industrialists proclaim unceasingly that Germany is ruined, and endeavour to prove their assertion by pointing to the ruin of the old capitalists whose property has been spirited away and transferred to the very people who declaim that Germany is utterly impoverished.

Inflation has benefited German industry, commerce, and agriculture, not only by abolishing their indebtedness and transferring untold millions of capital from the investors to the active business men, but because it has, at the same time, reduced taxation to the utmost. Prices and profits increase *pari passu* with the decline of the mark. A business man who some time ago had an income of a million marks, has now an income of several hundred million, and pays with the utmost delay income-tax on a million marks. Thus, the nominally high income-tax rates yield next to nothing, and income-tax is scarcely worth collecting from the income-tax payers proper. Nevertheless, we are told that Germany is the most highly taxed nation in the world, and in support of this statement are shown tables of nominal tax rates which, indeed, are high. The yield of the income-tax and other direct taxes is almost nil, not only for the reason mentioned, but also because the tax-gatherers apparently wink at evasion or even favour it. Possibly they do so under instructions.

It is not easy to ascertain how much in taxes Germany pays, because the ever fluctuating mark makes it impossible to express tax results for a lengthy period in terms of sterling. However, during the month of March of this year the mark exchange was steadily maintained at almost exactly 100,000 to the pound; and during that month, the proceeds of some important German taxes were as follows, in pounds sterling:

Income-tax (up to 60 per cent.) from industry, commerce, agriculture, professions, etc.	£	95,437
Income-tax (up to 10 per cent.) deducted from wages		1,790,793
Corporation tax		18,421
Capital tax		5,049
Property tax		357
Inheritance tax		7,455
Motor-car tax		1,838
Betting tax		5,000
Beer tax		918
Sugar tax		348
Matches tax		152

We can form the best idea as to the real burden of German taxation by multiplying the March result by 12. If we do so we find that the German income-tax payers proper pay, per year, less than 1,200,000*l.*; while Great Britain, with a much smaller population, pays nearly 400,000,000*l.* It will also be noticed that the relatively small income-tax deducted from wages yielded, in March, nearly twenty times as much as the income-tax paid by income-tax payers proper. The reason for this startling difference is obvious. The income-tax payers proper pay, with the utmost delay, in greatly depreciated marks, with the result that they pay perhaps 1 or 2 per cent. of the real amounts they ought to pay; while the small rate taken from the wage-earners is deducted week by week. It is usually estimated that of the income of nations only about one-third goes to the wage-earners. As the income-tax deducted from wages is very small, while the amount payable by income-tax payers proper is very high, it is obvious that the income-tax payers proper should pay vastly more income-tax than the wage-earners.

The German Corporation Tax yields on the basis of the March results 150,000*l.* per year, the loudly advertised Capital Tax yields 60,000*l.* per year, the property tax 4000*l.* per year, the inheritance tax 90,000*l.*, the motor-car tax 20,000*l.* per year, the betting-tax 60,000*l.* per year, the beer tax 11,000*l.* per year, the sugar tax 4000*l.* per year, and the tax on matches 1800*l.* per year. Most of these taxes require an enormous administrative apparatus, and in many cases, especially in the case of

complicated taxes, such as the property tax, the motor-car tax, etc., the cost of collection is probably ten or twenty times as great as the proceeds. The Germans are a nation of beer drinkers. While the beer tax yielded more than 100,000,000*l.* in this country per year, it yielded only 11,000*l.* in Germany. The 'Frankfurter Zeitung' stated, on April 26, that taxation on a glass of beer, costing 600 marks, came only to 15 pfennigs, or  $\frac{1}{4000}$ th of the selling price. The items given suffice to show that, chiefly owing to inflation, but also probably owing to policy, taxation in Germany is a joke.

The total tax revenue collected in March which, be it noted, was a particularly favourable month from the point of view of revenue collection, came at the stabilised rate of exchange to 5,062,795*l.* If we multiply that figure by 12, Germany's taxation per year would be equivalent to 60,000,000*l.* If we allow for the difference in population we find that British taxation is fully 20 times as high as German taxation. This is not surprising in view of the figures given.

It should not be thought that the trifling revenue obtained is applied to legitimate expenditure. Apparently more than the whole of the national revenue of Germany is swallowed up by the State railways and the post office, which are run at a loss exceeding the sum total of the taxes collected. The German Government has published figures, according to which the deficit of the services mentioned and Germany's total revenue of the financial year ending March 31, 1923, compare as follows:

Total German revenue 12 months 1922-23 . .	M.1,288,251,000
Estimated deficit of railways and post office . .	1,978,982,000

The deficit of the State railways and post office, therefore, exceeded the total revenue of the country by more than 50 per cent. We can visualise this extraordinary fact by imagining that State railways and the post office over here would cause a loss of 1,300,000,000*l.*, during the present financial year. While Germany collects, comparatively, a ridiculous trifle in the form of taxes, it spends lavishly by subsidising trade and industry, and helping the people in general by artificially cheapening food, railway travelling, postages, and many other things.

On March 1, when the German exchange had been stabilised at 100,000 marks to the pound, new and greatly increased postal and railway charges came into force. At M.100,000 to the pound, some of the salient charges were as follows: Local letters,  $\frac{1}{10}$ th of a penny; local postcards,  $\frac{1}{20}$ th of a penny; long distance letters, a farthing; long distance postcards,  $\frac{1}{10}$ th of a penny; foreign letters,  $\frac{3}{4}d.$ ; 11 lb. parcels up to 40 miles distance,  $1\frac{1}{4}d.$ ; beyond 40 miles distance,  $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ , etc. The third-class fare on fast trains was fixed on March 1 at  $\frac{1}{10}$ th of a penny per mile. The vast majority of Germans, however, travel fourth class, which costs only about half as much as that. We cannot wonder that the whole national revenue did not suffice to cover the deficit of the post office and the railways alone.

Nevertheless, we hear it said that Germany is the most highly taxed country in the world. Of course, it must be borne in mind that people who were formerly wealthy have, in many cases, become impoverished. People with fixed annual incomes of, let us say M.100,000, who formerly kept horses, and so on, with their whole income can buy at present only enough dry bread to last them for two or three weeks.

Although Germany pays practically nothing in taxes, it is not easy to increase taxation greatly unless a change takes place in the policy of the Government and the attitude of the people. Rightly considered, taxation is paid not in money but in goods. A certain quantity of goods is claimed by the Government and is handed over to Government servants in the form of salaries, etc. Nations, as individuals, can pay taxes only out of the excess of income over expenditure, out of the excess of production over consumption. A large excess of production over consumption enables individuals and nations to pay large amounts in taxes; while small margins allow only of small sums being so paid. In Germany there is no surplus of income over expenditure, because consumption is greater than production. At present, production per worker is equivalent only to about 60 per cent. of the pre-war production; while consumption is equal to about 80 per cent. of the pre-war consumption. There is, therefore, a very large deficit in the national household. Germany is in the

position of a man who earns 10,000*l.* per year, spends 12,000*l.*, and then pleads that he cannot pay taxes. The fact that production has shrunk greatly may be seen from Government statistics and from numerous company reports and other documents. Coal production per miner per day has declined to 60 per cent. of the pre-war output, iron production per worker to half the pre-war production, about 10,000,000 acres of land which used to be under the plough have gone out of cultivation, and hundreds of thousands of additional officials are unnecessarily employed by the railways and the post office. Dr Gothein, an ex-Cabinet minister and a very able man, stated last year in the '*Berliner Tageblatt*':

'If a nation reduces its production by one half, it can consume only half the quantity of foreign goods, and it must reduce its standard of living accordingly. It cannot improve its position by raising wages. Unfortunately we have learned nothing from the experience of Russia, Poland, and Austria. Reduction of output leads to an increase in the number of workers. Although the work done has shrunk very greatly, the number of our postal workers is by more than 100,000 greater than it was before the war. The State Railways carry fewer goods and passengers and serve a much diminished area. Yet the personnel is greater by 300,000 than in 1913.'

'While in other countries working hours and output per worker have increased, the German workers have struck against additional hours. In coal-mining the output per worker per shift has been shrinking from month to month. The German iron industry had to restrict its output through lack of coal although we import English coal in unprecedentedly large quantities. In June and July we paid to England from M.40,000,000 to M.45,000,000, gold, for coal, or three times as much as we paid for foreign coal in pre-war times. It is true that the refusal to grant us a moratorium in respect of M.32,000,000 gold has brought about a severe fall of the mark. However, the payment of M.40,000,000 to M.45,000,000 gold for coal has a worse effect upon our currency, because shortage of coal causes our industries to lose their markets everywhere.'

'The fall of the mark is powerfully promoted by the excess of our imports over exports. Even if we need not deliver any reparation coal, if the Peace Treaty was revised in the most generous manner, and if we were granted a large international loan, the irresistible decline of the mark would continue as long as the German miners refuse to give us an output similar to the pre-war output. . . . The position in other industries

is similar to that of coal-mining. Farmers and agricultural labourers act exactly as the miners do, and those willing to work are prevented from working by threats. Germany is being betrayed by its own people.'

Another ex-Cabinet minister, Dr August Müller, writing in the '*Berliner Tageblatt*', said :

'If we wish to prevent prices rising, we must deal in the first place with insufficient production. Our production remains far behind that of pre-war times. The productivity of industry may be seen by its coal consumption. If we allow for the loss of territory, we find that industry consumed in 1913 about 7,200,000 tons of coal per month. During the second half of 1921 it consumed only 5,523,000 tons per month, including lignite according to its calorific value. Privy Councillor Duisberg stated that chemical output had sunk below half the 1913 production. Railway traffic in 1921 came to 75 per cent. of the 1913 figures. . . .

'The decline of German production would have led to the downfall of our currency even if no reparations had been paid. The German Statistical Office estimates that our production is equal to about 60 per cent. of the peace output. If we assume that our consumption, including reparations, comes to at least 80 per cent. of our pre-war consumption, it will be found that Germany works with a deficiency of 20 per cent. We pay for part of our imported food and raw material with German goods and for the balance with paper money, and it is understandable that foreign nations will no longer take marks. The reparation problem merely adds to our trouble, the real intrinsic reason of which is to be found in the enormous decline in the productivity of our industrial and our agricultural labour.'

A nation which consumes considerably more than it produces has no margin for taxation or for reparations. That is obvious. Before the war, German production greatly exceeded consumption, and there was a large yearly surplus invested both at home and abroad. How, then, is it that production has fallen so low and that consumption has not declined in a similar manner?

Inflation has not only transferred gigantic quantities of capital from the rightful owners to active business men and reduced interest, rent, which has been fixed, and taxation to the vanishing point; but it is largely responsible for the shrinkage of production and for expenditure exceeding income. Workers whose wages

have been considerably increased desire to have a better time, desire to work shorter hours and to spend more. During the post-war boom, when wages rose rapidly, output declined both in Great Britain and in the United States, and the demand for a higher standard of living led to consumption exceeding production. This unhealthy position was remedied by vigorous deflation on both sides of the Atlantic. Deflation, the withdrawal of credits, forced on liquidation. It entailed much suffering. Industries came to a standstill, workers lost employment, and the logic of facts convinced them of the necessity of producing more and consuming less. Thus a proper balance in the national economy was promptly re-established. Production once more exceeded consumption and an adequate margin for taxation was created.

In Germany the Government has refused to deflate by stopping the reckless printing of banknotes. The powerful industrialists and agriculturists benefited vastly by the inflation, as has been shown. It wiped out their indebtedness and abolished interest and rent. The industrialists threatened that stabilisation of the mark would lead to general unemployment which might have the worst consequences upon Germany's internal peace, and roused their workers against the policy of deflation. The revolutionary government, which came into power in November 1918, wished to make itself popular. It voted increases of salaries and subsidies of every kind with lavishness and recklessness, while failing to provide the funds required by means of taxation. Working hours, also, were compulsorily reduced. Before the war it was customary in many German industries to work in a rather leisurely manner for ten hours a day. The working day was shortened to a nominal eight hours, and, as dawdling and idling has become universal, the hours actually worked come on an average only to about six. Herein lies another reason for production having shrunk to 60 per cent. of the war production, irrespective of the shrinkage in the area and population of Germany.

The socialists and democrats who had seized the reins of government did not discourage free spending on the part of the people. The new leaders had told their followers for many years past that the advent of democracy would create a new heaven and a new earth.

No adequate taxes were put upon luxuries, such as beer, tobacco, and sugar, with the consequence that the consumption of popular luxuries has increased enormously. The ruined middle class, the old investors, are, of course, totally impoverished. Their consumption has been curtailed to the utmost. On the other hand, the workers, and especially the unskilled workers, who form the large majority, live as well as they did before the war, and even better. Skilled and unskilled workers receive practically the same wages. Besides, the masses pay no rent. In many cases inflation has reduced rents to a penny a week and less.

Until now, Germany has been able to spend considerably more than she earned, to consume more than she produced, partly by plundering the old middle class, partly by selling marks abroad. It has been estimated that foreign nations have bought German marks and mark securities for at least 400,000,000L With the money thus obtained, Germany has been able to make ends meet. As Germany has paid in cash reparations less than 100,000,000L it is obvious that foreign nations have paid Germany's cash reparations several times over. Incidentally it should be remarked that the German official statements of the reparation payments effected are hugely exaggerated. According to the various official statements published, Germany has paid from 36,000,000,000 gold marks to 56,500,000,000 gold marks, and some official estimates place the value of the reparation payments made and of the territories lost at 100,000,000,000 gold marks or 5,000,000,000L Figures such as these need scarcely be taken seriously. The estimates of the Reparations Commission come only to about one-twelfth of the last sum.

The capacity to pay is determined in the case of individuals and of nations not so much by the fixed capital they possess, as by their income, and particularly by their yearly surplus created by the excess of income over expenditure. Inflation and the various other causes enumerated have caused Germany's expenditure greatly to exceed her income, as also her revenue as furnished by taxation. Meanwhile, the real wealth of Germany, the capital of the nation expressed in the terms of fields, factories, workshops, railways, waterways, and

roads has been increased by the application of vast sums spent in improving them. There can be not the slightest doubt that with her increased and modernised plant Germany, though reduced in area and population, can produce far greater values than she did before the war. Consequently the country is able to create a far greater surplus of income over expenditure than she then did, especially as her national debt has been wiped out by deflation and her expenditure on army and navy is reduced to a trifle. If the German workers produce goods at the pre-war rate and practise a reasonable economy in expenditure, Germany's yearly surplus may well become twice as large as before the war.

It has frequently been stated that vast sums of German money and of other values have been taken abroad to escape taxation. The complaints made with regard to this are not correct. Taxation, as has been shown, is trifling in Germany. Those best able to pay pay almost nothing. People have taken their money and other valuables abroad, not so much through fear of confiscatory taxation, which does not exist there; but through fear of losing the whole of their capital in consequence of the shrinkage of the mark. A German boot manufacturer, who must buy every year 100,000*l.* worth of leather, cannot afford to leave that amount in the German banks where it would rapidly shrink to nothing. He sells his boots in Holland and elsewhere, and leaves the proceeds abroad for future use. Land-owners have exported capital by selling their estates, investing the proceeds in miscellaneous export goods, sending them across the frontier, selling them abroad, and placing the money received in British, American, Swiss, and other safe currencies and securities. Many banks and private people have acted in a similar manner.

The apparent poverty of Germany is, of course, greatly increased by the disappearance of liquid money. Cash invested in fixed interest-bearing securities or deposited with the banks has been shrinking so rapidly in value, that no one in his senses keeps or buys Government stocks and other fixed interest-bearing securities or keeps money at the bank, either in the form of deposits or of balances. A shopkeeper who receives a few hundred thousand marks for a suit of clothes does

not put the money into the bank, but rushes off to the wholesaler and buys another suit. If he waited a few days, half the money might be lost by depreciation. Inflation has crippled the German banks as it has crippled German investors. The value of their fixed interest-bearing securities has disappeared, and it is impossible for them to lend money at normal rates. Owing to steady depreciation they might receive only one half, one quarter, or even less of the sum advanced. The result has been that the banks do not lend at ordinary rates, but at usurious rates. In order to protect themselves against loss, interest charges of 100 per cent., 200 per cent., and more per annum are common. As a rule, advances are made only for a few days or weeks at 10 or 20 per cent per month or more. Legitimate banking business has almost disappeared. Its place has been taken by finance business, speculation of every kind, and stock jobbing. Industry and commerce, which formerly depended upon the banks, require little financing, as their indebtedness has been wiped out by the destruction of the value of the currency. The German banks have fallen from their high estate. An industrial magnate can easily buy up a large bank. People still save, but they put their economies either into foreign currency—waiters and chambermaids gamble in pounds and dollars—or into objects of lasting value. Private individuals buy with their savings jewellery, works of art, rare books, clothing, and commercial goods of every kind; while business men convert their surplus into additional factories, workshops, and machinery. Throughout Germany new factories, shops, and office buildings are springing up. The impoverished banks are building everywhere new banking palaces. After all, it is safer to put money into bricks and mortar than into mark securities.

Germany's capacity to pay is vastly greater than before the war. Her earning power is probably as great, notwithstanding the territorial losses she has suffered, because these have been offset by the extraordinary improvement of the machinery of production and distribution. On the other hand, her current expenditure has been reduced to a minimum by the disappearance of the national debt and the State debts which in the

aggregate were considerable, and by the notable reduction of the military and naval expenditure which formed so onerous a burden before the war. It may, therefore, be estimated that Germany's possible surplus should be twice as large as before the war, provided reasonable efficiency prevails in production and reasonable economy is maintained in public and private expenditure. Her capacity to pay is much greater than is generally realised. A government which has the will to create order could easily convert Germany's poverty into abounding prosperity. The mark can be stabilised at any moment by stopping the printing of notes. It is true that that step will bring about a crisis in finance, industry, and commerce, accompanied by widespread unemployment; but such crisis must occur in any case. When it comes it will teach the German workers that they cannot consume more than they produce, and will cause individual production not merely to equal but to exceed pre-war production; for the improvement of machinery effected since 1914 will make increased production per worker per day quite easy. Vastly increased production will furnish a great surplus of goods for export on the one hand and will reduce the importation of those goods which Germany herself can produce on the other. If German miners produced as much coal per day as they did in 1914, Germany would have an exportable surplus of coal of about 40,000,000 tons per year in excess of all the Reparation coal demanded. She need not import foreign coal. Before the war, she exported a million tons of sugar per year. Lately she has been importing sugar instead of exporting it. She has been importing enormous quantities of bread-corn, although her leading experts are of opinion that, with the large amount of nitrates, potash, etc., produced at home she can raise all the breadcorn she requires. At present, German imports vastly exceed the exports. This cannot continue much longer, since foreign nations refuse to accept German marks. Greatly increased production will create a favourable balance in German foreign trade which can be applied to reparations. Unfortunately, the determination not to pay reparations has become general, and therein, not in economic circumstances, lies the difficulty.

## Art. 8.—COVENTRY PATMORE.

1. *Poems* (Collective Edition in two vols., including Poems by Henry Patmore). Bell, 1896.
  2. *Principle in Art*, etc. Bell, 1896.
  3. *Religio Poetæ*. Bell, 1893.
  4. *The Rod, the Root, and the Flower*. Bell, 1895.
  5. *Memoirs and Correspondence of Coventry Patmore*. By Basil Champneys. Two vols. Bell, 1900.
  6. *Coventry Patmore*. By Edmund Gosse. Hodder & Stoughton, 1905.
- And other works.

COVENTRY KERSEY DIGHTON PATMORE was born on July 23, 1823. The calendar alone is faithful in its mute reminder that a hundred years have passed, for men's affections are not occupied with Patmore's work, and it would be foolish to speak of his name in connexion with a centenary 'celebration.' He is celebrated but as a lonely hill in a quiet land, shown on the map, but visited merely by those to whom the hill air, and its solitude, are a stimulation and a delight. The greatness that his admirers have never ceased to claim for him may have been silently acknowledged, but has never been widely felt; and for most readers he remains a name in a catalogue, an illustration, a cipher, a shade.

Great poets are creatures of their age, even if they show greatness equally in expressing and transcending it. Patmore and Tennyson were both Victorian poets and in the truest sense the voices of their time; and they each, but in different degree, transcended their time. Tennyson was a dominating figure, standing firm amid his generation, and only distinguished by his loftiness of thought and grave attitude of a spiritual legislator; but Patmore was isolated alike by his genius and by the intense arrogance of his regard of a world surging turbulently beneath him. He expressed his time in 'The Angel in the House,' he transcended it in 'The Unknown Eros,' standing scornfully or sorrowfully remote in many odes in the latter, consciously and even proudly alien in certain prose essays. Exceptions to these general statements may be noted, but the statements represent the broad facts.

It is not altogether fanciful to read his character in his face. The portraits, especially that by Mr Sargent, by which he is best known, show a mind alert, bold and perverse, a spirit impetuous and unconciliating. The eyes are gem-like, but the light in them is not cold, and it is that quick light that redeems the countenance from hardness. Nor is it fanciful, perhaps, to read his history into his face. The son of Peter G. Patmore, who was concerned as second in John Scott's duel with Lockhart's friend, Christie; educated at home and in Paris, and thus escaping, I cannot say whether unfortunately, the influence of Oxford and Cambridge in the 'forties; entering the Civil Service (through the British Museum), that great nursery of men of letters; marrying once, twice, thrice, and each time gaining in temporalities and inward happiness; joining the Roman Catholic Church at the point of his second marriage; publishing the first part of '*The Angel in the House*' when he was but thirty-one and tasting briefly the sweets of popularity; staying silent from 1863 to 1877, and finding then scarce any audience; reconciling himself to obscurity, and a little disdainful of what was denied him; saddening as he looked out upon his time, but serene in obedience to silent admonitions; contented meanwhile to publish his wilful, epigrammatic essays of a beautiful prose texture, and at length slipping almost unperceived and almost unhonoured out of life at the age of seventy-three—that all this should be traceable in the portraits is impossible, but there is still a strong harmony of the painter's counterfeit and the image called up by the reader's inward eye. Patmore was the least impersonal of writers, and so his work somewhat easily yields us an image of deep shadows and high lights, to set beside the likeness made in the most personal of mediums—the painter's.

As I have said, he was a very young man when he published '*The Angel in the House*', and added his still, domestic voice to the larger utterance of other singers. Tennyson, the Brownings, and Arnold were already famous, the eloquence of Ruskin and Carlyle was already familiar, philosophy already knew Mill, and science was shortly to give birth to '*The Origin of Species*'. Patmore, in fact, rose amid the rich chaos of Victorian literature at its central point. The angel of his title has been

commonly held to refer to the lady of the poem, but more reasonably to the unknown Eros of the odes. The poem still provokes the amusement of those who indolently fail to relate it to the rest of Patmore's work, and, because it seems so easy to understand, do not think it worth understanding. The same hasty indolence prevents their reading the later odes, which are not at all easy to understand ; and hence the author has been dismissed, even by intelligent people, as too simple altogether and by others as too obscure. Certain professors of literature, including Mr Saintsbury, have treated him as a minor-minor poet, a chicken clucking between Tennyson's feet, a mote dancing in Ruskin's ray. The courtship of a dean's daughter, the marriage, the honeymoon journey, the unadventurous adventure of merely faithful wedlock—who will not smile at the tameness of a domestic epic? Habitual readers of verse are fondest of lyrical and dramatic poetry ; the social recitals of Cowper and Crabbe no longer delight and are the mild pleasure of lax moods only. And again, the common attitude to marriage being no longer quite inflexible, the oriental view of woman being equally immoral and outworn, it is no wonder if the central idea of the narrative is itself a count against this poem. Patmore wrote it while he was still a Protestant, but the inward rigidity which it discloses, and which I cannot deny or diminish, suggests that he was already prepared for the conversion that followed it.

It is by a miracle, then, that the poem remains not only readable but even delightful, tinctured faintly with dogma but quite blessedly with humour. It sailed, somewhat slowly, into popular favour, but with the rise of Swinburne and the passionate lyricism of 'Poems and Ballads,' Patmore's note was contemned or merely unheard. His song was like a robin or, in his own phrase, a heavenly-minded thrush ; and the exuberant clamour of a new and earthly music, the audacity of that heady, intemperate beauty, drew away the attention of critical readers until at length popularity, too, waned and neglect followed. Forty years ago his very name, says Mr Gosse, was ridiculed ; the wonderful odes had been published only a few years before, but they shared in the neglect or the contumely cast upon the earlier poems.

'The Angel in the House' is the simplest of things, and its depths are as lucid as the mental atmosphere in which it was conceived. Patmore's temper was vehement, his temper so strongly marked and, in later years, so independent of opinion that it seems hardly possible that his early work should have been so smoothly acceptable as it proved. He was made up of contradictions. He could not easily bear restraint, yet invoked it in his essays; he was proud, but exalted humility; his mind was critical but capricious; he had a great deal of ability in the practical affairs of life yet despised science; he was faithful in his affections and steady in his persuasions, yet forsook his native creed when he had reached mature years, without avowing an adequate reason; and after that change, though still inwardly defiant, he was so subdued to authority that he burnt some hundreds of copies of 'The Angel in the House' lest they should offend—singular misgiving! Long after, as we shall note, he destroyed for a similar reason the manuscript of an unpublished essay. His intellectual apprehensions were swift, but his passions were gusty, and he was at the mercy of both. There was a war in his members.

His early poem, however, does not reflect this war, but rather a glittering peace. It is the expression of a mind at home in a world of its own, not wholly our common world and not wholly an alien world, but his own intersecting our common world. He makes the best of both worlds for the characters of his poem. The privileges of cultivated life, the ardours of virgin love, the sunny obscurities of poetic vision and mystic religion—these compose the twin-featured subject of his muse. In form, the verse deludes with its ease, an ease that never degenerates into carelessness or slides into vacancy; there is, on the contrary, a token of patience in the neat development of the story, with cantos and prologues, preludes and epigrams; narrative and comment advancing cunningly together. Perfect quatrains fall as thick as apples in autumn:

'One of those lovely things she was  
In whose least action there can be  
Nothing so transient but it has  
An air of immortality.'

It is characteristic of Patmore that in his idealisation of love he yet speaks of sleeping 'undisturbed' by love, and there is a touch of wisdom in his lines :

'Love wakes men, once a lifetime each ;  
 They lift their heavy lids, and look ;  
 And, lo, what one sweet page can teach,  
 They read with joy, then shut the book.  
 And some give thanks, and some blaspheme,  
 And most forget ; but, either way,  
 That and the Child's unheeded dream  
 Is all the light of all their day.'

There is, again, an aspect with which this idealisation seems not to be quite incongruous, the innocence with which eight lines are used to tell the 'first expense for this sweet Stranger, now my three days' wife'—the purchase of sand-shoes. 'I'm ready, Felix, will you pay?' It was such a passage as this, and such an impression as several parts of the poem convey, that urged Swinburne to his parody, 'The Person of the House,' one of the happiest inventions of the 'Heptalogia' :

'The sickly airs had died of damp ;  
 Through huddling leaves the holy chime  
 Flagged ; I, expecting Mrs Gamp,  
 Thought—"Will the woman come in time?"'

And Dr Garnett, too, must have been smiling over such phrases, when he said that Patmore had no perception of the sublime in other men's writings (a hard piece of justice, perhaps), or of the ridiculous in his own.

'The Angel in the House' revealed Patmore's vision of life in its most blessedly human relation. The later odes, and much, of his prose work, were meant to express his vision of life in its rarer relation to the divine, but before approaching these there is 'The Victories of Love' to note; firstly, to say that the metrical form is slightly different and shows a maturer ease, which is sometimes ease in 'sinking'; and secondly, that there is heard a new note, now recognised as most purely Patmorean, the note of poignance, sounded more sharply in the odes, but already clear enough. 'The Angel in the House' told joyously of a union of happiness; its successor, of a union in which 'less than highest is good and may be high.' Love's not time's fool, says

Shakespeare, and Patmore here bends all his serious sweetness upon the singing of love as the stealthy sly master of time and fate. There is so much simple beauty and sincerity in the poem that it is not hard to endure the singular essence of Victorian convention which, otherwise, might bring opprobrium upon it in 1923, when other manners disguise conventions a little more pliable. But Patmore cared nothing for convention as convention; he did not esteem marriage as a remedy against sin but as a sacrament, and all the vivid arts of his verse were subordinate to that passionate idea. He was as deeply concerned with questions of sex as any modern novelist, and he brought to them a keen, cold, and radiant psychology. Indeed, in all his earlier work there is, besides the fluent narrative interest, this far profounder interest of a psychology which is beyond the touch of any older poet of his time, and which only Meredith, of his immediate successors, was able to approach; while the continuous narrative itself formed a constant, firm background for the psychological development that was inevitably wanting in the discontinuous form of the odes.

The odes contained in 'The Unknown Eros' of 1877 form a body of metaphysical poetry which, although sufficiently distinct from the earlier verse, is yet plainly nursed by the mind that produced 'The Victories of Love.' The human foreshadowing the divine, the divine completing itself in the human—this is not an innovation of the odes, but a full flowering of what was already budding in the narratives. Loosely it might be said that in his two chief books Patmore did not write two poems but one poem; more precisely, the sexual idea, and the distinction of masculine and feminine, pervades all he writes, whether creative or critical, verse or prose, and whether his immediate subject is the character of Keats or the contemplation of God. He was born to mysticism, and it was probably with a secret satisfaction, foreseen when his first wife said, 'When I am gone they will get you,' that his thoughts turned towards the Church of the spiritual Doctors he loved. Those mystical writers had for him the authority of the great poets, and the great poets themselves he held in no higher honour than the mystics.

His second marriage redeemed his widowed years from a loneliness that might have proved tragic, and his conversion at the same time coincides also, as Mr Gosse points out, with the appearance of an unmistakable gesture—that of a man who, having tasted popularity, contemns it; having been recognised by his peers, disdains them; and having come in contact with those who alone possessed the ‘distinction’ he prized, slowly disengages himself from them and grosser contacts alike. His native aristocracy of mind was sharpened by a derogation of the great coarse world, which he came at length to despise as swimming remotely in its own fog. Dyspathetic is the one word which describes Patmore’s attitude to his country and his time. Yet by the side of this stiff and confident disparagement a candid humility was preserved; his intense personality was sunken in an ‘heroic good’; life became pure spirit, materiality thinned and faded, and the relations of men and women were etherealised into an ever bolder prefiguration of a divine order. Perhaps there is something odd, at first sight, in a mystic who accepts as easily as Patmore did the amenities of the external world; for while we allow that a beggar may be indifferent to things beyond his reach, we fail, rather illogically, to recognise a kindred indifference in a man who possesses what most covet. Yet the sincerity of Patmore’s vision may not be doubted; like all originals he became more and more surely that which he essentially was.

Yet unlike many of those who use symbols, he did not despise his symbols; the body that figured his parable was nobly honoured as :

‘Creation’s and Creator’s crowning good.’

Never was there a saner and healthier mind than Patmore’s, and he used the most daring images without the least hint of self-consciousness or morbid inhibition. Something of Donne had always lurked in his temperament, and now something of Donne was expressed in his imaginations; and happily for those that read him for his poetry alone and not for his idea, this something includes the intensity which leaves Donne and Patmore almost isolated among the English poets.

The odes, then, make a double appeal, although it is wrong to attempt to distinguish the parts. They appeal to the spiritual core of every uncorrupted heart, and also to the aesthetic mind that lives by the apprehension of beauty. Patmore himself would not welcome even the convenience of such a distinction, but it is inevitable. Many of the odes are political, the first of them provoking new laments that so fine a poet should write so ill of his country; yet even here he ends with a frankly smiling phrase :

‘Grant that I remain  
Content to ask unlikely gifts in vain.’

Almost every one is a metaphysical ode, and a particular idea is repeated time after time, as if to show how naturally the poet plunged into contemplation of the little that exceeds the great :

‘Tis but in such captivity  
The unbounded Heavens know what they be !’

Who can express, he asks elsewhere :

‘How full of bonds and simpleness  
Is God,  
How narrow is He’?

To see things thus subtly is to see them simply, for a true metaphysical view does not complicate, but shapes and orders the disarray of thought, as a magnet orders the confusion of metal fragments. Patmore relates the seen to the unseen, the shadow to the substance, and beholds all in the radiance of a sudden extraordinary light.

‘Shall I, the gnat which dances in Thy ray,  
Dare to be reverent? Therefore dare I say,  
I cannot guess the good that I desire.’

In another kind there is the beauty of :

‘I, singularly moved  
To love the lovely that are not beloved,  
Of all the seasons, most  
Love Winter, and to trace  
The sense of the Trophonian pallor on her face.’

For although the subtilising of sex is a chief purpose of his writing, it is not the only gift in his giving ; more

easily received, more conspicuously precious, is the tenderness, the poignance already noted in 'The Victories of Love,' which makes 'The Azalea,' 'Tristitia,' 'Departure, and some others almost unbearable in their fingering of the sensitive mind. 'It is not true that love will do no wrong,' and 'Tears of recognition never dry,' are lines better known in this way than any others of Patmore's; and I will not add to them here. But it would be wrong to say nothing at this point on the supreme merit of the odes, the merit of style. Consider it in the notation of natural phenomena :

'In nook of pale or crevice of crude bark,  
Thou canst not miss,  
If close thou spy, to mark  
The ghostly chrysalis,  
That, if thou touch it, stirs in its dream dark.'

Patmore objected to a preoccupation with small detail and thought that a poet should refrain from microscopic art ; and so it is right that against this faithful minuteness should be set 'Wind and Wave,' with its hint of the unfathomable and immense, or even better, the opening of the ode, 'To the Unknown Eros' :

'What rumour'd heavens are these  
Which not a poet sings,  
O, Unknown Eros! What this breeze  
Of sudden wings  
Speeding at far returns of time from interstellar space  
To fan my very face,  
And gone as fleet,  
Through delicatest ether feathering soft their solitary  
beat?'

The irregular ode is a perfect medium for Patmore's oracular mood. It was not his invention, but he used it uniquely, and it is the best example of his theory of verse as a sequence of inflexions of the normal. As a recent critic suggests, it represents the liberation of the strict form of the narratives, and achieves perfect beauty in its equal reliance upon law and liberty. It is the most delicately rhythmic of all verse forms, the resilience of the line being subtly increased by alliteration, commonly subdued though essential, and yet scarcely losing its power when confessed :

'And minatory murmurs, answering, mar  
The Night, both near and far.'

All his technical excellence, and larger excellence as well, will be found in 'Amelia,' one of the longest and tenderest of the odes. It is only a little less homely than 'The Angel in the House,' starting with the soberest of phrases, 'Whene'er mine eyes do my Amelia greet,' and yet it is one of the noblest of love poems since Spenser's. Style makes it great, though I hasten to add that it was conceived in a great mood and could not have been conceived greatly at all in another mood; and it is, ultimately, style, expressed in the complete harmony of the rational with the intuitive faculty, that makes Patmore a great English poet.

'I think the odes,' said one of his children, 'are very like Holy Scripture in being so simple that any one might imagine they understood all there is, and so profound that few will really do so. They are also like Scripture in the way Shakespeare is, viz., in being intensely human, and in not saying the words allowed to express the thing, but the *thing* itself.'

The author himself in a moment of unusual exhilaration cried, 'I have hit upon *the* finest metre that ever was invented, and on *the* finest mine of wholly unworked material that ever fell to the lot of an English poet!'

Yet he knew himself unregarded, and was proudly content. 'No plaint be mine of listeners none!' he muses, and at another time answers a reproach that he does unwisely in speaking plain truths, which should be cloaked in a dead language, 'Alas, and is not mine a language dead?' It is the line with which 'The Unknown Eros' concludes. He lived nearly twenty years after publishing the odes, but wrote no more verse; and if before his mortal voice was still he reflected again upon his dead language of verse, he may have smiled to remember that the dead languages have never died.

He forsook verse, but remained a poet in his prose. In one lost essay, the fruit of ten years' meditation, he pursued the familiar sex symbol, and Mr Gosse has told of the lamentable destruction of 'Sponsa Dei,' the entire manuscript being burned as the result of the author's

conversation with Father Gerard Hopkins ; for Hopkins, himself a poet of incalculable because unintelligible genius, had said, 'That's telling secrets,' when he read the essay and saw how it developed Patmore's central theme. Ready as the author was to fulfil the highest office of a poet by telling secrets that were lawful, the peril of telling secrets that his Church might think it unlawful to tell was too great; and thus the most uncontrollable of men sacrificed at a word what might have been, for all we know now, a work as original in thought as, Mr Gosse assures us, it was rare in style.

Of Patmore's prose there are, however, abundant specimens available. The volumes of essays and sentences on literary and other matters are witnesses to his remarkable expressiveness, for the whole man, save that rarest part which verse alone could reveal, is here frankly discovered : wise and tender, proud and petulant, hard to please and lavishing praise; readier to repulse than to welcome, to offend than to satisfy; narrow and aspiring, a man of extremes. I cannot pretend that his character seems wholly amiable in its attraction, for his independence was shown in asperity, and his sense of right and wrong, both in spiritual and æsthetic matters, perceived no ambiguities. Cold yet flamelike, and suggesting to Mr Sargent a drawing of his head as Ezekiel (an odd tribute, perhaps), he reflects a white intense light from his own personality upon many of his subjects, while upon others he is merely freakish and perverse. Blake, in his view, drivelled, Herrick was a gilded insect, Emerson apparently a mill-wheel clacking in vacancy, Shelley a beautiful, effeminate, feeble-minded boy ; the subordination of women to men was a privilege, for woman is the last and lowest of all spiritual creatures; and perhaps the only real use of natural science was to supply similes for poets. So might we pick out with indulgence or amusement the things we would not care to say even to ourselves. But the essays nevertheless gleam with wisdom, with those starry refractions which excite as well as bewilder us, and which it is hard to refrain from quoting here.

Yet a doubt emerges after reading many of them, I mean in particular the essays dealing with other than literary matters. These strictly irrational utterances

and remote speculations, the prompting, indeed, of airy monitors, are more proper for verse than prose, and in fact are already contained, explicit or implicit, in the odes. It is easy to accept the incomprehensible when the noblest rhythm of verse awakens and sustains the attention and gives thought the speed of wings; but the idea expressed as a sudden revelation in an ode may seem a mere paradox in the curt prose of '*Religio Poetæ*'. True the prose is brilliant and hard as a jewel, but it provokes dissent and resistance as the verse seldom does. But for these essays we should not have seen so clearly Patmore's limitations, we should not have known that in aspiring towards an unapprehended world, of which the highest of earthly things are but symbols, he was contracted more and more narrowly into himself until, in his last years, his thought was but a thin rod of light springing from the nether to the upper darkness.

Nevertheless, he was a whole and consistent being. He is rightly called a mystic, and is in no sense a merely intellectual writer of mystical sympathies. He is no more an English Maeterlinck than Maeterlinck is a Belgian Shakespeare, and it would be preposterous to confuse him with writers who are willing to give mysticism a trial, as if it were a secondhand coat that could be cut down to fit, or stretched to disguise the gross protuberance of age. Mr Burdett attributes to him a system of thought, but the intellectual coherence which that implies was not within Patmore's reach. His constancy was emotional and founded in character, and he was incapable of rationalising the impulses of his heart.

It is not easy to forbear a question as to his position as an English poet, now that a hundred years have passed since his birth and nearly thirty since his death. In 1886 he wrote:

‘I have written little, but it is all my best; I have never spoken when I had nothing to say, nor spared time or labour to make my words true. I have respected posterity; and, should there be a posterity which cares for letters, I dare to hope that it will respect me.’

In the case of certain of his great contemporaries, Tennyson, Browning, and Swinburne, much of their prolific work

can be disregarded, and enough will yet remain to compare with Patmore's entire production. They dealt with varied subjects, their sympathies were diffused over the colonies and outliers of the intellectual empire; but Patmore's virtue is shown in concentration. He is the peer of the greatest of them in his utterance of ecstasy and the nobility of his style. He alone is a metaphysical poet and is not properly comparable with them at all, but with Meredith. Being metaphysicals, Patmore and Meredith perceived the world, both intellectually and spiritually, as other than it seemed; to the one it was less real, to the other more real than its appearance. Patmore saw man in the visible world as the beloved of God, his soul as the bride of God; Meredith saw him as a brave or fretful being, 'come out of brutishness' indeed but still subject to 'the sacred reality'—inscrutable Earth. Each poet at length was absorbed in his theme, but while Patmore's music became aerial and fine and so died away, Meredith's became perplexed until its obscurity matched perfectly the obscurity of his faith. But all these comparisons are foolish, for genius is unique and therefore incomparable, and the final impression of Coventry Patmore's poetry is an impression of pure genius. It fulfils Swinburne's strict test by eluding all tests and outsoaring criticism.

JOHN FREEMAN.

## Art. 9.—STATE PATERNALISM IN THE ANTIPODES.

POLITICAL philosophers, both ancient and modern, have frequently emphasised the remarkable points of resemblance between absolute democracies and monarchies. In his famous 'Reflections' Burke quoted Aristotle's opinion to the effect that, under both forms of government, citizens of the better class are equally oppressed, and few thinkers challenge the Greek sage's statement to the effect that the courtier and the demagogue are political twin-brothers. The former prostrates himself before Cæsar, the latter before Demos; that is the sole difference. Certainly, as the instrument of oppression, the tax-collector has superseded the executioner; while the courtier of the mob, less attractive so far as external graces go than that of the monarch, bawls uncouth flatteries to his exacting masters in our parks and public halls. Hypocrisy and servility do not always appear in court dress. One may find among the innumerable appeals of the French revolutionary orators to the sovereign people more than a century ago, and among the utterances of the Bolshevik leaders in Russia to-day, expressions of adulation as ridiculous as any recorded in Persian or Byzantine annals. 'Les extrêmes se touchent.' And in policy also the parallel holds good. The preachers of extreme democracy in their proposed levies on capital and other confiscatory designs show the inclination ascribed by De Tocqueville to absolute monarchs to follow the example of the savage who cuts down the tree in order to obtain its fruit. The demagogue in power is an even more energetic, if less highly skilled, axeman than the despot. It is noticeable, too, that State paternalism attains its highest degree of development in communities under ultra-democratic and those under despotic rule. Motives of self-preservation urge the monarch to feed and clothe to the best of his ability the masses whose contentment is the foundation of his throne. Those of ambition and self-interest impel the demagogue, invested with precarious authority, to lavish material comforts on the poorer class of electors to whose capricious favour he owes his elevation. Political necessity in each case compels the

sacrifice of the minority for the majority, the capable for the incapable, the fit for the unfit.

Among all civilised countries in the world to-day Australia may with some reason claim the dubious distinction of having made the greatest progress in what is commonly called 'humanitarian' legislation. From infancy to senility the average Australian citizen is the object of the State's paternal solicitude. Each Australian mother on the birth of her child receives from the hands of a sympathetic Government the sum of 5*l.*, nominally to defray the expenses attendant on maternity, actually in a considerable number of cases to provide herself with some little memento of the happy event. Among the flippant in the Commonwealth references to the 'bangle' bonus are common, and the young mother there is frequently distinguished by a maternity ring on her arm as well as a wedding ring on her finger. Occasionally, it is whispered, the happy father thinks the event worthy of celebration with festive rites, and the maternity bonus takes the form of paternity beer. It serves also other purposes not originally contemplated by a well-meaning Legislature. For instance, some time ago the Council Clerk of a large Australian town received with gratification a letter from a defaulting ratepayer threatened with legal proceedings in which the writer pleaded for a short respite, explaining that his wife having just blessed him with twins of the immediate value of 10*l.*, he hoped within a few days to be able to discharge his obligations.

The effects of the maternity bonus in Australia have fully illustrated the difference between benevolence and beneficence, and there are now heard, in medical and other well-informed circles there, insistent demands that a more effective and less crude specific shall be devised for meeting the claims of indigent motherhood without weakening in the case of the father that proper sense of parental responsibility which is the main support both of the family and the State. It is not gratifying to find that in more than ninety out of every hundred cases of child-birth in Australia within recent years the ignominious dole offered by the Government has been eagerly claimed; and even wealthy parents are now not ashamed to take it. During the last six months of the

year 1922-1923 no fewer than 68,745 claims for maternity allowances were granted in the Commonwealth as compared with 68,258 for the corresponding period of the previous year. These figures have a doubly unpleasant significance. They show increasing public expenditure, and a declining sense of self-respect among the people. While, however, the objections to the maternity bonus as now dispensed in Australia can be sufficiently justified on practical and financial grounds, those based on moral considerations which will be referred to later are far stronger. On the other hand, the most competent observers are unanimous in holding the opinion that no perceptible improvement in the birth-rate, or amelioration in the physical condition of Australian mothers and infants, has resulted from the indiscriminate and unconditional distribution of State doles of the kind now referred to, and the provision in their stead of free maternity hospitals for all really necessitous cases, and skilled medical advice and treatment wherever needed, is strongly recommended.

It may be added that among political philanthropists of a common type in Australia there is now a strong movement in favour of the State endowment of motherhood and childhood. The late Labour Government in New South Wales was pledged to the introduction of a measure under which practically all the children of wage-earners in the State would have been supported up to the age of fourteen by the tax-payers. At the late Federal General Election the opponent of the Prime Minister in North Sydney, Mr Piddington, K.C., who stood as an independent candidate, strongly advocated a scheme by which each employee would receive a minimum wage of 4*l.* a week, while, in addition, the employer would be required to pay the sum of 12*s.* weekly to the Government for every person employed by him. All contributions from this source, it was proposed, should support a fund out of which an allowance of 12*s.* weekly would be made to all married workers for each child under the age of fourteen. Thus, an unmarried employee would receive a weekly wage of only 4*l.* a week, while a man—possibly an inferior worker—with five young children would be paid by the employer and the State combined no less than 7*l.* a

week. Mr Piddington afforded no satisfactory explanation as to how Australian industries could bear the burdens he proposed to place on them, or why payment should be for families rather than merit; but the fact that in a strongly anti-Labour constituency he obtained nearly 12,000 votes against the 16,000 cast for his formidable antagonist is highly significant. It seems certain that a Motherhood Endowment Bill will be one of the earliest measures submitted to the Federal Parliament by the next Labour Ministry.

When old enough to go to school each boy and girl in the Commonwealth is subject to laws by which in all the States education has been made free and compulsory. Australian legislatures, without exception, have accepted unquestioningly the rather disputable contention that, if the State insists on the child being educated, it must bear the entire cost. Democrats of a common type in the Commonwealth are, indeed, in the habit of asserting dogmatically that whatever is compulsory must necessarily be free. They overlook the fact that the application of this convenient doctrine would relieve the citizen, not only of the obligation of discharging his tailor's and draper's bills, but also that of paying taxes. Under these conditions the administrators controlling public finance would be confronted with some perplexing problems. As it is, a demand is frequently heard in 'advanced' labour circles in Australia that all children attending the public schools shall be provided with bodily as well as mental sustenance at the public cost. Free education in the Commonwealth, too, is by no means confined to the mere essentials of knowledge. The State High Schools there are institutions which, in regard both to the range of subjects taught and the scholastic attainments of the teachers, compare favourably with the best of the secondary schools under private management. Neither Warren Hastings nor George Stephenson enjoyed during childhood one-tenth of the educational advantages now offered freely to the child of every manual worker in all the capital cities of Australia. Indeed, the son of the Australian artisan carries, if not the baton of a field-marshal, the diploma of the professor, the judge's wig, and the bishop's gaiters in his school knapsack. As to the prizes of political

life, he may aspire (assuming, of course, the possession of the necessary flexibility of principle) to a knighthood, or even the august position of Prime Minister. So far as the future of each youth depends on educational benefits, Australia is, emphatically, a land of complete equality of opportunity.

It is not, however, given to the offspring of every artisan or wharf labourer to become a successful doctor, lawyer, business man, or even politician. The mental machinery bestowed by undemocratic nature on each child, after all, counts for something, and the seeds of learning do not grow and fructify in stony brains. It may here be suggested with due humility that a thoroughly democratic system of public education entails an enormous waste of intellectual and nervous energy on the part of the teachers, and of time on that of a considerable majority of their pupils. If the efforts of the former were concentrated on the task of developing to the full the gifts of the mentally superior among their pupils, instead of being wasted to a large extent in the hopeless attempt to convert dullards into scholars, the interests of the community, as a whole, would be greatly promoted. But the provident State in Australia does not neglect its intellectual weaklings after they have served their time in school. On reaching his eighteenth year the comparatively dull-witted youth has but to join a trade-union and a gracious judicial functionary soon prescribes for his benefit a 'living wage' sufficient to maintain in what the judge considers 'reasonable' comfort, not only the individual worker, but a wife and three children besides. These latter luxuries he frequently denies himself, and therefore, whether he be competent or incompetent, industrious or idle, he receives for his sole enjoyment an income considered adequate to the comfortable maintenance of five persons. Figures quoted by Mr Hughes in the debate on the report of the Basic Wage Commission in November 1921 showed that at that time the 'living wage' doctrine postulated the existence in Australia of no fewer than 500,000 non-existent wives and 2,000,000 unborn children. Education there is compulsory but, so far at all events, matrimony is not. Possibly, seeing that so many Australian bachelors now receive the

'living wage' on the implied condition of marriage and parenthood, Australian maidens may some day insist that all unmarried workers of sound physique shall be required by law to assume the responsibilities they have hitherto shirked. Such an innovation would at least assist towards the solution of the population problem. Incidentally, it would have the additional merit of providing work in the divorce courts for a number of now unemployed lawyers.

One might suppose that the young unmarried worker in receipt of wages sufficient to maintain in comfort a fair-sized family would at least be expected to provide for his own future, and to save enough to keep himself in the event of illness or unemployment. This, however, is not the view of his obligations taken by a compassionate legislature. Should he, through accident, misfortune, or the effects of self-indulgence, become permanently unfit for work, he has but to approach the official authorities with a request for assistance, and, if destitute, he will be granted an invalid pension of 15s. a week. On reaching the age of sixty-five, assuming that he has not utilised the abundant opportunities within his reach during the active period of life to provide for his own support when incapacitated by age, he can claim an old-age pension of the like amount. Compulsory idleness is virtually a condition attached to its enjoyment, for the pension becomes liable to forfeiture should the recipient undertake such light work as he is well fitted to perform, and so increase his income. This foolish restriction is a wrong both to the pensioner and the community, depriving the former of additional comforts and the latter of useful services. The Labour Party in the Federal Parliament is now definitely committed to increasing pensions of both classes to not less than 20s. a week, and many of its supporters strongly urge a further increase to 30s. In a recent speech, Mr. Charlton, the leader of the Party, expressed himself in favour of the prompt diversion of the whole of the modest 2,000,000*l.* now assigned annually to defence purposes in Australia to the maintenance in augmented comfort of the aged and the infirm. Motives of political expediency have been imputed to the author of this proposal, but, setting them aside, it seems to have been

dictated rather by benevolence than wisdom. Even those whose trust in the League of Nations and the Washington Disarmament Treaty is most profound, must feel doubtful whether, in the event of war, Australia would find an army of well-paid pensioners led by politicians an effective substitute for her renowned Anzacs. Gibbon's caustic comment on the conduct of those degenerate Roman Senators who tamely submitted to the edict of Gallienus which debarred them from military service might, perhaps, be brought under the notice of some of our modern pacifists and humanitarians. They would do well, even in this age, to remember that 'those who refuse the sword must renounce the sceptre.'

According to the latest figures, there are now 106,111 persons in the Commonwealth drawing old-age pensions, and 39,366 more in receipt of invalid pensions. Nevertheless, to show that the people of Australia, in spite of the efforts of their rulers to discourage the exercise of thrift and self-denial, have not yet lost those wholesome qualities, it may be added there are now no fewer than 3,345,346 depositors in the State and Commonwealth Savings Banks, the deposits aggregating the substantial sum of 163,000,000*l.* In view of these figures it would certainly seem feasible to substitute a system of compulsory insurance for the wholesale granting of unearned pensions. It is difficult to find reasons based either on justice or sound policy to justify the taxing of the provident classes of the community for the benefit largely of the improvident.

In the foregoing brief summary of the benefits lavished by a paternal Government, either directly by legislation or indirectly by the awards of special industrial tribunals, on multitudes of Australian citizens mainly belonging to the class usually designated as 'workers,' no reference has been made to other advantages in the way of unemployment grants and other forms of temporary relief from time to time bestowed in addition. For instance, during some months past the majority of the non-official white inhabitants of the town of Darwin have been practically supported by the Government owing to the prevailing lack of local employment, and the Administrator of the Northern Territory stated in

December last year that no fewer than 300 persons there were then receiving free rations. It appears that, although offered free passages by sea to any port in the south of Australia, these unprofitable citizens of the Commonwealth refuse to leave a place which, thanks to the 'White Australia' delusion, has virtually become a State almshouse. The enormous wages the sugar-planters of tropical Australia are compelled by judicial order to pay their employees are also, in a large degree, clumsily disguised subsidies reluctantly bestowed on a privileged class of workers by the Australian sugar-consumers, who are required to pay correspondingly inflated prices for a necessary commodity.

It may probably be said with confidence that, for its population, directly and indirectly, Australia devotes a larger sum of money each year for the improvement of the material condition of the wage-earning masses than any other country in the world. Their mental requirements, too, as before shown, are amply provided for. Apart from the ordinary State educational systems, numbers of well-equipped technical schools and public libraries afford the aspiring worker every opportunity of extending his knowledge. An unusual provision in the Commonwealth Navigation Act stipulates that the owner of each Australian vessel over a certain tonnage shall bestow on all members of the crew the same privileges in regard to the use of the ship's library as are enjoyed by the passengers, unless, indeed, a separate library of a suitable kind be provided for the exclusive use of the crew. An old British sea-dog, by the way, who never enjoyed a bath during a calm voyage unless he had the good fortune to fall overboard, would be amazed to see the luxurious arrangements for the provision of hot and cold water baths for the benefit of the seamen and firemen which distinguish modern Australian steamers. The sleeping accommodation provided for the crew, also, is sumptuous when compared with that offered by the forecastle of the ordinary passenger vessel fifty years ago. These innovations are altogether commendable, for the contrast between the conditions under which the average worker at sea and his comrade on shore, respectively, lived up to a quite recent period was altogether shocking. In the Antipodes, at all events,

Jack has now nothing to complain of, and he ranks among the aristocrats of industry.

A simple-minded stranger might suppose that a community in which the welfare of the poorer class of citizens was so carefully studied by the Legislature would be one of the most prosperous and contented in the world; that feelings of jealousy and class-hatred would be non-existent; and that the Government which freely dispensed so many good things would be regarded by the recipients of its bounty with the greatest respect and affection. Since, politically, the servant is above the master in Australia, the former at least should be satisfied with a state of things which enables him to retaliate by means of the Statute Book for any wrong, real or imaginary, done him by his employer. The man whose word is law only in the factory is decidedly at a disadvantage when contending with opponents whose collective word is law in Parliament. So the former would naturally be disposed to maintain that attitude of conciliation which, as a rule, disarms hostility and leads to mutual good feeling.

Alas, owing to one fundamental error, that of regarding human happiness as dependent on material rather than on mental and moral conditions, all the philanthropic efforts of the Australian legislatures have hitherto failed to produce among the masses that general feeling of contentment which is essential to national well-being. Between the years 1913 and 1921 there occurred in the Commonwealth no fewer than 3791 labour disputes involving together a loss of 18,300,000 working days, and about 11,000,000*l.* in wages. During the last three months of the year 1922 alone, according to the latest official returns published by the 'Commonwealth Statistician,' there were 102 disputes which cost the workers directly 200,000*l.*, and the employers and public probably a yet larger sum. Australian industries have suffered in an increasing degree from the diseases of indiscipline and idleness among the workers. General Booth, after his last visit to Australia, expressed the opinion that a spirit of indisposition to work was more observable among the wage-earners there than in any other country he was acquainted with. The liberality of the industrial tribunals has only bred discontent and covetousness among

their beneficiaries. The game of grab has been played persistently and acrimoniously, and even those supermen known as politicians have joined in it. Wages in some industries have risen to such a height that 'the Australian standard of living'—of which Ministers of the Crown and other potentates are accustomed to speak in the most reverential terms, as though the working man in Australia, by Divine right, was entitled to luxuries unknown to his comrades elsewhere—threatens ere long to rival that distinctive of ancient Sybaris or Capua. Bitter feelings have been aroused between employers and employed, townsmen and countrymen, wealth-producers and wealth-consumers. And, worst of all, the viper of Communism, warmed in the Commonwealth's hospitable bosom, is now showing its gratitude in the manner described in the familiar fable.

The growth of a spirit of revolt and lawlessness has not, however, been confined to industrial circles in the Commonwealth within the last few years. Since the end of the war particularly there has been a deplorable increase of crime in all the great cities. Statistics show an increase of over 3000 in the cases of drunkenness dealt with by the Sydney police in the year 1922 compared with 1921. Excluding those of a civil kind, the courts in the Sydney metropolitan area dealt with 56,274 cases last year, while the total for its predecessor was 54,178. Nearly 4000 persons were charged with larceny, and 1200 for burglary. Minor offences such as cargo-pilfering, bag-snatching, the robbing of gardens, poultry yards, etc., are now exceedingly numerous, though, as a rule, the offenders either escape detection or, for reasons of charity or expediency, are not handed over to the police. The Australian criminal is an artist in his own line and singularly resourceful. The fact that crime in Australia, especially among youths, has shown a marked tendency to increase for several years past is admitted in all responsible and official circles, but as to the chief causes of such increase, and the best way of bringing about better social conditions, there is considerable diversity of opinion.

The prevalence of unemployment, the effects of 'shell shock' and nervous disorders resulting from active service during the war, the ravages of the cigarette, and,

above all, the unwholesome suggestiveness of picture shows of a too common kind may be regarded as causes contributing to the prevailing evils. But the most competent judges only assign these a secondary place. In November last year the Presbyterian Assembly in Victoria appointed a special Committee to investigate the causes of crime and to recommend measures for its prevention. After full inquiries the committee furnished a report in which the opinion was expressed that the criminal class in Australia was largely recruited from the State schools.

'There can be no doubt,' the Committee affirmed, 'that among children attending school, criminal acts, or acts indicating criminal tendencies and dispositions, are of far more frequent occurrence than is generally realised. Theft, untruthfulness, truancy, coarseness, and even immoral conduct are offences which are surprisingly common. It is no exaggeration to say that a definite percentage of our school children, under our present system, will inevitably enter upon a career of crime or immorality, while others will join the ranks of loafers and incapables.'

In making these strong statements the Committee very properly blamed the system, and did not in the smallest degree censure the able and conscientious men and women who are engaged in the work of public education in Australia. The tendency of all State educational systems, unhappily, is to exalt mentality above morality, cleverness above goodness, intelligence above character. In regard to the moral training of their pupils the teachers are under crushing disabilities. Individual supervision is impossible when large masses of children have to be taught collectively, and when, not only sexes, but all varieties of juvenile dispositions, aptitudes, and temperaments are indiscriminately mingled together. The teachers have enough to do to maintain order and impart knowledge—necessarily of a somewhat superficial kind owing to the wide scope of the curriculum—without studying the special characteristics of each individual pupil. All are treated alike. Uniformity is the master passion of the bureaucrat, and the Procrustean methods he applies to education are fatal to healthy mental and moral development. Apart from the inherent defects of mass teaching two of the worst

features of most so-called democratic systems of State education are the lack of any effective checks on the admission to the public schools of children of a highly undesirable type, and the rigorous limitation of the powers of expulsion bestowed on the teachers. Every practical educationist knows that the presence of a few children of vicious inclinations in a school has most harmful effects on the prevailing *moral*. The play-ground, unfortunately, in the case of the average city State school is far too small for healthful exercise and that training of character which, in the great English public schools, attends the discipline of school games. Crowded together in small spaces during the intervals between the hours of study, children, originally pure-minded and morally sound, catch all the more readily the contagion of bad manners, bad habits, and bad language spread by the carriers of moral disease. Some persons hold the strange notion that the depraved child is speedily reformed by association with healthy-minded children. It were as reasonable to contend that the best way to cure persons suffering from small-pox would be to allow them to mingle freely among persons not affected by the disease. Such a doctrine would be more acceptable to undertakers than to physicians. There can be no doubt that special arrangements for the segregation and separate educational treatment of physically, mentally, and morally abnormal children are essential to the maintenance of a healthy tone in all State-supported schools. The Victorian Education Department has lately taken steps in this direction which might well be followed by the educational authorities in all the Australian States. More than mere knowledge is needed to produce a good citizen.

But the root of the evils referred to in the report previously noticed, and others of a yet more serious kind affecting the very life of the State, lies deeper. Sin, whether active in the form of crime or passive in that of vice, is usually the product either of tainted heredity or parental neglect. The abnormal or neglectful parent is by far the chief contributor to the sum of the world's misery. And, ignoring for the time the dominant factor of heredity, the unfit parent is largely the product of unwise and demoralising legislation.

When the State spoils the parents the latter inevitably spoil the children. The granting of the maternity bonus is a tacit recognition of the right of any reckless and impecunious youth in Australia to marry and become a father without providing beforehand for the fulfilment of even the most elementary obligation of fatherhood. Thus the State directly encourages the increase of the improvident and irresponsible. The wholesale bestowal of old-age pensions free from contribution or sacrifice of any kind on the part of the beneficiaries militates both against thrift and individual self-respect. To be 'on the parish' in former days was regarded as a disgrace by the sturdy English peasant. To be 'on the State' has become the unworthy ambition of thousands of Australian workers, debauched by self-seeking politicians. The effects on family life of this spirit of dependence are most lamentable. The child for whose sake the father is called on to make little or no sacrifices, loses that habit of filial obedience which is based on gratitude and respect. Salutary domestic discipline is thus weakened. And as the State directly or indirectly relieves the father of several of his natural obligations towards his offspring during childhood, so it also relieves the latter in later years of the reciprocal obligation to support, if need be, their parents in old age. Thus the sentiment of family attachment is assailed at both the extremes of life, with results to the community that are far from being morally elevating. Political consequences of a far-reaching kind necessarily follow. A nation, after all, is but a family of families. Any influences, therefore, that tend to loosen the ties between parents and children must also weaken the allegiance of the citizen to the State. Indiscipline, undeveloped natural affection, and lack of mutual trust and sympathy in the home, are the seeds from which in later life spring the destructive impulses of lawlessness and revolt.

To a diminished sense of parental responsibility among the masses may be ascribed many of the unwholesome developments which, in Australia and elsewhere, mark the present age. The tendency of modern so-called 'humanitarian' legislation is to encourage the ignorant or half-educated multitudes, not to live for the community, but on it. The capable and industrious are

subjected to crushing taxation for the benefit of the idle and the inefficient, the result being, as sociologists have often pointed out, a marked decline in the rate of increase of the former and a corresponding acceleration in that of the latter. Reduced incomes among the provident and conscientious necessarily mean reduced families. Nevertheless, politicians in Australia and elsewhere carry their worship of numbers to such absurd extremes that in their estimation quality of human material is wholly subordinate to quantity. They speak and act as though a country to whose population half a million imbeciles were added each year were in a far more flourishing condition than another which could only boast a yearly crop of half as many physically and mentally healthy children. So long as public opinion complacently tolerates a code of morals which sanctions the casting each year of myriads of unhappy beings into the sea of life with stones round their necks, even the most enlightened legislators, it must be admitted, are powerless to find legal remedies for the worst ills that afflict humanity. To eugenists and social reformers who have thoroughly studied the all-important science of heredity belongs the task of spreading the beneficent doctrines taught by Francis Galton, Dr Huxley, Matthew Arnold, John Stuart Mill, and many others. But the figures and statements contained in the notable report furnished by the Commission on the Care of the Feeble-minded in Great Britain nearly twenty years ago should at least be sufficient to warn all legislative bodies of the danger of enacting laws by which conditions are created favourable to the multiplication of the less fit. Any law that tends to lower the popular conceptions of the responsibilities of parenthood, or that penalises the worthy for the sake of the unworthy, has that tendency, and is pregnant with future danger to the State.

'Uninstructed legislators,' wrote Herbert Spencer in his 'Sins of Legislators' many years ago, 'have in past times continually increased human suffering in their endeavours to mitigate it.' How far such legislators in these days are the products of a political system which necessarily subordinates in matters of government the higher intelligence and morality to the lower, and confuses, so far as the masses are concerned, the un-

questionable right to good government with the assumed right to govern, is a question which need not now be considered. Even in Australia, however, it may be observed, there are found reactionaries of some intellectual standing who fail to find satisfactory reasons why the gaol-bird should be regarded as the political equal of the judge, or the judgment of the illiterate tramp be treated as equal in value to that of the manager of a great industry, or the highly-trained member of a learned profession. But it is a marked characteristic of democratic legislation that it is based on the assumption that happiness depends solely, or mainly, on material comfort and opportunities for enjoyment. In aiming at the attainment of an impossible equality of social conditions, Australian legislators have throughout ignored the truth contained in that fine saying of Aristotle which tells us that the general welfare depends, not on the equalisation of men's possessions, but of their desires. Instead of fostering healthy ambition, and stimulating manly effort, political humanitarianism has destroyed contentment, the necessary ingredient of true happiness, and greatly weakened among the masses the ennobling sense of social duty. On the other hand, the disruptive forces of envy and cupidity have been strengthened in a perilous degree. Napoleon once declared envy to have been the chief cause of the great French Revolution, and no human failing, probably, has been the parent of more discord and misery. Politically as well as morally the results of excessive legislative indulgence have always been disastrous. Patriotism withers when benefits are received without service or sacrifice. A Government loses all respect when it becomes a mere dispenser of charity. 'Ubi bene, ibi patria,' is the motto of the spoilt child of the State. Australia now possesses exceptional claims to be adopted as a fatherland by patriots of this exalted type.

It is noticeable, nevertheless, that with the growth of a spirit of vicarious generosity in Australian Parliaments the public respect for those bodies has steadily declined. There is a universal distrust of the political philanthropist who is always ready to use the public funds for the wholesale distribution of grants and pensions. While, no doubt, in many cases those benefactions are prompted

by a real wish to do good, even the least observant can hardly fail to perceive that no small number of the politicians who continually demand further extensions of the charitable activities of the State are men who are not peculiarly distinguished in private life by the exercise of philanthropy. Motives not unconnected with self-interest are therefore ascribed to them. They undoubtedly encourage many of their supporters to vote rather than work for a living. To the mind of the honest man indirect corruption is more repulsive than direct, although to the politician who practises it, the former method is decidedly the less costly. But the moral loss to the community caused by the diversion of large sums of public money from useful purposes to those of the kind now referred to is far greater than the material. The history of decadent Rome tells us how rapidly the moral fibre of the descendants of the conquerors of Carthage weakened under the pernicious system of State paternalism introduced during the distracted period which immediately preceded the fall of the Republic. Pensions and General Elections now take the place of bread and games, and the exhibitions in the Parliamentary amphitheatre are happily bloodless. Fortunately, however, the youth of Australia and the virility and independence of its people ensure to the latter safeguards against degeneration unknown to the exhausted and impoverished masses of the greatest of ancient cities.

Young countries can successfully combat political diseases which often prove fatal to the old. But the time seems to have arrived when the rulers of the Commonwealth need reminding that national greatness depends on national character, and that while it is wholly right that the State should respond promptly and generously to the appeal of undeserved misfortune, it should exercise the most scrupulous care lest, by unwisely enlarging the scope of its benefactions, it should weaken among the people those moral qualities which are the necessary foundations of healthy corporate life.

F. A. W. GISBORNE.

## Art. 10.—M. RAYMOND POINCARÉ.

'HE seeks only to understand men, individuals,' the late Jules Lemaître said once of Sainte-Beuve, 'and that is less impossible than to understand the world or history.' In M. Lemaître's reflexion there is comfort for any one who is interested in personality but apt to be bewildered by politics—any one who, recognising that life is too short for a really thorough-going study of events, yet feels that in some measure he can enter into the minds of the men and women taking part in them. The problem of the Ruhr, for instance, is extraordinarily complex: to join usefully in the discussion of it one ought to be an expert in economics and possess encyclopaedic knowledge, not alone of France and Germany, but of the whole of Europe.

It should be 'less impossible' to understand M. Raymond Poincaré, the sturdy, square-jawed, very honest-looking, very typical little soldier-scholar-journalist-lawyer from Lorraine, who is now Premier of the French Republic. What sort of man is he? For six months past we in England have had him pictured to us alternately as an unscrupulous and dangerous Imperialist, a fanatical hater of the Germans, a wooden-headed blunderer, a weak tool of men abler than himself. We shall know better what to think of these somewhat conflicting conceptions of the Poincaré of to-day if we glance for a few moments at the earlier phases of his career.

Raymond Nicholas Landry Poincaré was born—so the State Register attests—'on Aug. 20, 1860, and at five o'clock in the afternoon,' at Bar-le-Duc, in the *département* of the Meuse, a town famous for its soldiers: even before the Great War it had given France two Marshals and over fifty Generals. Both his father (a civil engineer of some prominence in Government service) and his mother came of families of good standing, long settled in Lorraine. 'A notable boy, serious, energetic, kind, speaking and writing well,' young Raymond left his native place in 1876 for Paris, there to study philosophy at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand. The years 1878–79 saw him a law student in the Quartier Latin, living in the same house as his cousin, and senior by six years, Henri

Poincaré, the mathematician. By the end of 1880, having completed the first phase of his military service,\* he had settled in the capital for good, a full-fledged barrister, but with no practice as yet and earning his livelihood by his pen. Readers of the 'Voltaire' knew him as 'Maître Aubertin,' a legal chronicler and commentator. He wrote regularly for the 'XIX<sup>me</sup> Siècle,' too, and a few poems and a short novel from his pen had been accepted by 'L'Echo de l'Est.'

It was probably not much of a novel, but in those early student days of his in the Quartier there must have been material for an amusing book by some one who to the skill and charm and humour of a Murger or a Du Maurier could add a zest for other things beside love and the arts. It was still the same Quartier, quite unchanged, and we may be sure that the little Poincaré group—a group of six—knew something of its gaiety and romance. The two cousins took their meals at the Pension Laval, an establishment of which Gambetta and Daudet and François Coppée had been frequenters. Here they met regularly their four great friends: Etienne-Alexandre Millerand, the present French President; Gabriel Hanotaux, so famous since both as statesman and as historian; Maurice Bernard, destined to be a great lawyer; and Paul Revoil, a future Governor-General of Algeria. Raymond Poincaré, it appears, was the quietest of the lot—'la prudence Lorraine,' the others called him. But he was no prig, no pedant, he could laugh and quarrel. His square jaw had already attracted notice. 'Sacre bleu!' Dumas fils is said to have exclaimed when the resolute-looking youth was pointed out to him, 'Quand celui-là tiendra un os, il ne le lâchera pas!'

The years which followed were less interesting. They were plodding years for the most part, relieved by one or two oratorical 'hits'—addresses delivered upon ceremonial occasions. At last, after a long period of hard work in comparative obscurity as assistant to a distinguished advocate, Maître du Buit, Raymond Poincaré's chance suddenly arrived. In 1886 M. Jules Deville, Minister of Agriculture, also from Lorraine,

\* Later, in the Reserves, he rose to be Captain in the Chasseurs Alpins.

invited him to be his Chief of Staff. He accepted, and although a Ministerial crisis in the following year put his patron out of office, his own political career was well launched. In June 1887 he was sent to the Chamber of Deputies as a representative of the Meuse.

M. Louis Madelin, the brilliant historian, then a boy of sixteen, was present at the first public meeting addressed by the young candidate at that 1887 election, and he has recorded a vivid impression of the scene.

'He came forward to the front of the platform,' writes M. Madelin. 'He was small, thin, somewhat pale, bearded, his hair *en brosse*: an austere young figure in his closely-fitting frock-coat. . . . His fashion of speaking struck his more serious listeners as excellent: every syllable was carefully articulated, every word told. No verbal flourishes, very little political jargon, not an attempt at wit. It seemed, indeed, as if this young man was incapable of smiling. He discoursed on taxation and on the Budget with wisdom and knowledge, with acuteness and common sense. When he was interrupted—for he had hecklers to right and left of him—he replied sharply and to the point.'

There was at least one 'attempt at wit,' according to another witness, and not too bad an attempt. A member of the audience scoffed at the speaker for his youth. 'I quite agree,' he answered. 'I am very young. But listen!—I hereby make you a formal undertaking. That is a fault of which I promise to cure myself every day of my life!'

The next twenty-five years of Raymond Poincaré's existence may be summarised in about as many lines. His Lorraine prudence kept him absolutely silent in the Chamber until he found an opportunity of revealing his mastery of economics in the Budget debates of 1890. In the short-lived Dupuy Cabinets of 1893 and 1894 he became Minister of Education and Minister of Finance respectively; then, in the Ribot Cabinet of 1895, also of brief duration, Minister of Education again. Between 1895 and 1906 he joined no Government. He disliked the compromises without which it seemed impossible for any Ministry to exist during that decade of trouble and anxiety for France. In 1898 he asserted himself courageously in regard to the Dreyfus affair, pressing

for a revision of the case; but he took no very conspicuous part in the other great questions which now agitated and so seriously divided French opinion—the Russian Alliance, for instance, or the *Entente Cordiale*. Instead, he resumed his practice at the Bar, becoming soon one of the two or three busiest *avocats* in Paris, specialising by preference as a champion of artistic and intellectual causes; societies of authors and painters and actors and journalists had recourse to him in their difficulties. Presently he became legal adviser also to the great industrialists of the North. Not until 1906, when M. Sarrien, the new Premier, offered him the portfolio of Finance, did he come back, for good, to politics, though in the mean time he had remained in Parliament, passing in 1903 from the Chamber to the Senate. In January 1912 he became Premier, in 1913 President of the Republic.

We have seen M. Madelin's description of the young candidate of 1887. Let us compare with it a portrait of the Senator of 1909. It was in December 1909 that M. Poincaré was elected a member of the French Academy. In the speech of welcome addressed to him on that occasion, M. Ernest Lavisse, editor of the great history of contemporary France, thus smilingly depicted him to his face—the passage comes in a long and elaborate résumé (for the most part delicately flattering, but relieved by touches of irony and banter) of the new Academician's career :

' You are in the Tribune. You begin simply, calmly, in order to secure silence and attention. In due course you enumerate the main divisions of the speech you have prepared : almost always they are three in number. You pass quite naturally from one to the other by the mere sequence of ideas, not too quickly, because you wish your words to be taken in, not too slowly, for the same reason. You fall back habitually upon general ideas, but your general ideas are never lacking in precision. You look to words to have a meaning and only one meaning. You have realised that such terms as "balance," "surplus," "deficit," change their meaning every year at the will of our Parliamentary financiers, and you insist upon the true and inexorable meaning which belongs to each. Then you go back to history to recall the financial doctrines of the Revolution or to describe how taxes

have been imposed ever since the beginning of the world. All this, without playing the schoolmaster—rather in the deprecating tones of one who fears he may be dwelling upon the obvious. Every now and then, your remarks evoke, not a laugh—you speak too quietly for that—but a smile. You continue, on and on, your audience listening docilely to your tranquil and abundant flow of language. At last one or two voices will cry out, "Take a rest!" And you will answer: "I am not tired but I can quite understand that the Senate must be!" Upon which, as the official report will say, there are "lively protestations of dissent." And between ourselves, these "protestations of dissent" come as no surprise to you. It is only natural, after all, that an audience should give its sustained attention to a speaker who makes himself so well understood.'

Absolute clearness of thought, sedate dignity, the faculty of adapting his style to his subject and to his audience—these, the Academicians were reminded, had been recognised as M. Poincaré's chief characteristics as a speaker. His place in the world of politics, M. Lavisse found it less easy to define; he was a Liberal, manifestly, but not the ordinary Liberal known to France; 'un républicain de gouvernement,' rather, standing midway between those Liberals who expected everything and those Socialists who expected nothing from 'la liberté individuelle': a 'moderate' but no half-hearted moderate—'un enragé de modéré,' as some one else called him; a clear-minded *doctrinaire* bent on certain specific and quite practicable reforms; a level-headed idealist; a student of life, moreover, remarkable for his 'ubiquité intellectuelle.'

One other such sketch—from the pen of M. Hanotaux, writing in 1913\*—will help us to visualise the newly-elected President:

'His personal appearance is most characteristic: short in stature, vigorous, alert, alive, the grey hair thinning above his very high forehead, his jaws massive and resolute, his blue eyes soft or bright according to the mood of his glance but always captivating . . . his manner of speech most simple and urbane, the words flowing easily and in abundance

---

\* Preface to M. Henri Girard's biography of M. Poincaré, published in 1913.

but with discretion: everything about him suggests a Frenchman of perfect balance, self-controlled but full of "go."

M. Hanotaux foresaw in his old friend an almost ideal President, judging him more particularly by the tact and power which he had already displayed as Premier when working with colleagues so dissimilar in views and temperament as M. Bourgeois, M. Millerand, M. Delcassé, and M. Briand. Then, there were his personal qualities to be noted too. France needed a President who would animate and encourage and support the newly-awakened activities of the nation. She would find one after her own heart in this man of letters, scholar, artist, this lover of all the things she herself loved. In choosing Raymond Poincaré, M. Hanotaux declared, the French had for once lived up to the motto of democracy, 'Le pouvoir au meilleur!' The new President had been raised to the first place in the State 'because, among the men of his generation, he was really the first.'

The entire appreciation glows with enthusiasm and hope. It ends with a passage which must be read in the original—both its fervour and its Frenchness would be lost in a translation. M. Hanotaux, blissfully free for the moment from the apprehensions by which, in less buoyant moods, men already then were being weighed down, is envisaging the future:

'Une France rétablie dans son autorité, sa discipline, son union intérieure, son entrainement physique et moral, pourra parler à l'Europe sans faiblesse et sans jactance, réclamer son dû et sa place au soleil: elle saura attendre l'heure et, si l'heure ne se présente, la saisir. Une Europe équitable a pour pivot une France raisonnable: aussi est-il bon que le chef de l'Etat français soit connu au dehors comme un homme de raisonnement et de raison.

'Sept années de paix et d'apaisement, des réalisations précises, des réformes populaires, plus de concorde entre les citoyens, une plus grande douceur dans les mœurs, une plus grande vigueur dans l'action, de plus hautes aspirations dans la pensée, un esprit sain dans un corps sain, la démocratie écartant la secte et la République restant vraiment ce qu'elle est: la chose de tous—tel est le programme que les circonstances entourant son élection et le mouvement de l'opinion

dictent au nouveau Président. Le temps et les hommes lui permettront-ils de le remplir?

Such language may now seem to savour of extravagant partisanship and irrational optimism, but it really reflected the mood of the great majority of Frenchmen at that moment. M. Poincaré's candidature for the Presidency had not called forth much feeling of any kind except on the part of a few extremely bitter antagonists, M. Clemenceau and M. Caillaux among them; once elected, however, this unimpressive-looking little sober-sides captured the imagination of the entire country by the firmness and confidence of his words and bearing. His prestige went up by leaps and bounds until at last, on the occasion of a triumphal progress in August through the regions round Toulouse, he met with 'a demonstration of popularity unparalleled in the history of France.' So says that unemotional chronicle, 'The Annual Register,' in its record of the year 1913. Beyond dispute, no French President was ever so acclaimed. But it was a popularity limited in a significant way—it was the popularity of an uncompromising Moderate. Extremists and fanatics held aloof. The Socialists and the ultramontane Catholics, from their opposite standpoints, viewed the hero of the hour with equal disfavour.

Even during those first six months, however, still more during the twelve months which followed, it almost seemed, despite his personal success, as though the fates and his fellow-men were in league to prevent the new President from fulfilling any of his high aims. Instead of achieving 'réalisations précises,' and 'réformes populaires'; instead of bringing about conciliation and tranquillity; instead of displaying greater strength in administration, the three Prime Ministers who held office during this period were pitifully weak. The first two of them, M. Briand and M. Barthou, were men of M. Poincaré's own group, Republicans of the Left, and perhaps as well fitted for their posts as any other politicians just then available, but they were both incompetent to deal with the serious difficulties and violent dissensions confronting them; their one feat was to bring in the Three Years' Military Service Law\* (of

\* Making the period of service three years for the whole army. It was already three years for the infantry.

which the President himself was the strongest supporter) and to stand by it in the face of unceasing opposition. Then, early in December, came M. Gaston Doumergue, supported by the Radical Socialists and the Socialists. Now ensued a time of much suffering and shame for France—a series of ugly scandals, conspicuous among them the so-called ‘Affaire Caillaux,’ the inquiry into which was compared by a Royalist writer to the lifting of a stone and the discovery of a nest of loathsome vermin underneath. When, in June 1914, M. Doumergue’s lease was up, the *moral* of the French had sunk to something very near its lowest. During the Ministerial crisis which followed Germany looked on grinning. What France was in real need of, remarked the ‘Leipziger Tageblatt,’ was not a new Premier, but a Receiver in Bankruptcy.

Then, suddenly, within a few weeks, came the War, and France, almost as by a miracle, was her best self again! It is too soon to try to estimate the President’s share in that marvellous national regeneration; at least, he set a fine example to his countrymen by his calmness and dignity. We can only surmise, too, the part which he played during the rest of the war-period. Admirers and censors make very different guesses at the nature and extent of his influence over the five Ministries which in turn governed the Republic—Viviani’s, Briand’s, Ribot’s, Painlévé’s, Clemenceau’s: during a war, as in peace-time, a French President has to be content to be an influence. It seems probable that, by sheer force of will and intellect, the President must have often swayed the decisions of the first four Premiers, but that he counted for next to nothing with the fifth. Some day the world, perhaps, will have M. Poincaré’s own record of his relations with the implacable old opponent to whom—recognising in him a true patriot and the only man in France equal to the great emergency—he confided the reins of power in November 1917. He did not cease to assert his right to advise. He continued to express himself fully, freely, and vigorously, for the most part by letter: so much we know, but little more. The gossips have but tantalised us with their glimpses behind the scenes. The whole story, when it can be revealed, will be of wonderful interest, even if, as seems

likely, it does not modify much the accepted notion of the two men and their roles: Clemenceau, the many-sided—hero and statesman and *gamin*, brilliant, masterful, flamboyant, overflowing with fun and ‘divilmint’; Poincaré, a grey figure by comparison, forced inevitably into the background, but watchful, resourceful, patient, untiring, selfless. It was the old man’s innings. It was Clemenceau who had the making of the brilliant hits and all the runs—more power to his octogenarian elbow! But little Poincaré kept his end up. And of him, also, it has been with justice recorded in the archives of the French Parliament that, by his efforts during those terrible years of conflict, he has deserved well of ‘la patrie.’

We may, perhaps, assume that while hostilities lasted, M. Poincaré could content himself with the conscientious urging of his opinions, leaving it to the headstrong old Premier to pay what heed to them he liked; but it was quite another matter when the Armistice and the Treaty of Peace came into question. These were subjects upon which, as a jurist and an economist, the President could speak with expert knowledge, and he intended to utilise to the full whatever powers the Constitution gave him. He was to find, however, to his chagrin, that these powers were all too scant, that his counsels, seldom asked, were often ignored or resented, and that he had to put up with second-hand, and occasionally belated, information as to the proceedings of the ‘Big Four.’ When, in some newspaper, two years or so later, M. Tardieu, M. Clemenceau’s right-hand man at Versailles, twitted M. Poincaré with being unable to speak of the Treaty negotiations from personal knowledge, the latter replied with a touch of sharpness that this was undeniably the case. ‘M. Tardieu,’ he wrote, ‘était aux premières loges. Le Président de la République n’avait qu’un strapontin au parterre.’\*

The prevailing impression in England—due in no small degree to Mr Maynard Keynes’s famous book, ‘The Economic Consequences of the Peace’—is that

---

\* ‘*Histoire Politique*’ by M. Raymond Poincaré. A reprint of his contributions to the ‘*Revue des deux Mondes*.’ ‘Strapontin’ is the French term for the backless seat at the end of each row in a theatre, used only when all the ordinary seats are occupied.

M. Clemenceau carried all before him at Versailles. We picture him as the irresistible hero of the Keynesian Comedy—as the Man who knew his own Mind: a reprehensible old cynic, of course, viewing History ‘as a perpetual prize-fight of which France has won this round but of which this round is certainly not the last’;\* but delightful, fascinating, endlessly clever, and, from start to finish, outwitting triumphantly the ill-equipped, slow-thinking Wilson, the too volatile, rudder-less Lloyd George, and of course the quite negligible Orlando. The impression of the Versailles Conference formed by the French in general and by M. Poincaré in particular is vastly different.

According to M. Poincaré, it was, in the first place, the British who reaped the chief benefits of the Peace, sinking Germany’s fleet, appropriating the best of her Colonies and cutting her wings as a commercial competitor; it was in the interests of the British Empire also, he points out, that the one serious modification was made in the ‘Fourteen Points’—that which provided for the ‘Freedom of the Seas.’ But it is not mainly over these things that M. Poincaré is concerned. His principal complaint is that M. Clemenceau, despite urgent warnings and remonstrances from himself and from Marshal Foch, was led to abandon a provision absolutely essential to France—the provision for the occupation of the left bank of the Rhine until the Germans should have completed the payment of the indemnity.† M. Clemenceau had been in full agreement with Marshal Foch and M. Poincaré that without this guarantee the indemnity would never be paid in full; but, beguiled by what was to prove the entirely illusory assurance of Anglo-American support against future German aggression, he gave way. The whole strength of the French position was thereby lost. Foch laughed loudly at the notion of the debt ever being recovered. M. Poincaré, in his more restrained fashion, deplored equally the ill-judged concession. ‘When the peace negotiations began,’ he wrote in September 1921, in an article in which he recapitulated

\* So different from us, with our unanimous belief in the League of Nations and our unsullied and unswerving idealism generally.

† A period which M. Poincaré estimated at thirty years. ‘L’occupation,’ he insisted, ‘n’a aucun rapport avec annexion.’

his views on the matter (having first reasserted very eloquently the indebtedness of all Frenchmen to the ex-Premier during the War), 'M. Clemenceau certainly entered into them and carried them through with the same patriotic ardour, but, not less certainly, it would be childish to deny that the Versailles Treaty has been a profound disappointment to France.'

It is, of course, M. Poincaré's general attitude towards the Reparations problem since the Versailles Conference, and more especially since he resumed the Premiership, that has brought upon him the condemnation of his English critics: to hear the name Poincaré now is to begin discussing the Ruhr. That subject is far too big for adequate treatment here, but three observations suggest themselves: first, that the French Premier, by virtue of his standing and antecedents, is entitled to be treated as a gentleman and as a humane and honourable man; secondly, that in the eyes of impartial onlookers Great Britain, while she retains the pick of the German Colonies, cannot without the grossest Pharisaism accuse France of cruelty to a fallen foe; thirdly, that it is mere folly to contend, as four-fifths of the English Press have been contending, that in the eyes of 'all intelligent people,' M. Poincaré's Ruhr policy is both a blunder and a crime.

Ten years hence we shall be able to discuss this difficult question with more coolness and with fuller knowledge than to-day. To-day, most assuredly, intelligent people are *not* unanimous upon it. Even in England, where trade interests preclude an entirely unprejudiced view, the occupation of the Ruhr has been defended with weighty and telling arguments by men whose qualification to speak on such problems is beyond dispute: it will suffice to mention one, Mr Hartley Withers.\* Outside England, and notably in the United States, there has been no lack of intelligent support for France. 'Public sentiment in this country, after a brief moment of rather obvious disapproval,' wrote a well-informed journalist, Mr Frank H. Simonds, in the American 'Review of Reviews' for March, 'has increasingly swung to the French side'; and, speaking from

\* See the 'Saturday Review,' January 27 and May 19, 1923.

intimate familiarity with French life, he added: 'The dominant sentiment in the France which I know is not materialistic or imperialistic in the ordinary sense; it is a will to live.'

And here is this detached observer's summing-up of the whole controversy: 'Had Britain stood solidly with France, Germany would have made an honest effort to meet reparations.'

The contemptuous abuse with which for many months past some English leader-writers† have attacked M. Poincaré has been astonishing. They have talked at him in the tones of an excitable school-teacher scolding the disgrace of the class. It would be a good thing if they could model themselves a little on the French Premier's own controversial methods, which are admirable in their suavity and sanity. He can be sharp and challenging but he is never violent or discourteous. 'Le style, c'est l'homme'—M. Poincaré's literary style tells us what he is: no intellectual giant, no inspired genius, no saint, but just a grave, thoughtful, cultured, kindly man, immensely industrious, supremely efficient, level-headed, determined, heart and soul a patriot and a Republican; not the man—as one wiseacre would have us believe—to act as catspaw to the perfervid M. Léon Daudet, novelist and essayist of note but, for all his energy and vehemence, politician *pour rire*; still less likely—though many people maintain as much—to be the foolish accomplice of sinister Money-Kings; but recognisable least of all as that wicked incarnation of Imperialism and Revenge and sheer Malignity depicted for us by the English Press with such wearisome repetition week after week.

FREDERIC WHYTE.

---

\* Mr J. E. C. Bodley, author of the great book on France, has recently expressed this view also.

† There have, of course, been some distinguished exceptions, among them Mr J. A. Spender.

## Art. 11.—THE ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

1. *A Dictionary of the English Language.* By Samuel Johnson, LL.D. Sixth Edition. London, 1785.
2. *A New English Dictionary.* Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, Dr Henry Bradley, Dr W. A. Craigie, and Mr C. T. Onions. Oxford : University Press, 1888. (In process of publication.)
3. *The English Dialect Dictionary.* Edited by Joseph Wright. Oxford : University Press, 1898.
4. *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English.* By Ernest Weekley. Murray, 1921.

THE making of dictionaries is an art which in recent times has taken a bewildering variety of forms. If we recall only such types as dictionaries of science, which may vary from glossaries of technical terms to specialised encyclopædias; dictionaries of biography, which may be national or connected with special classes or crafts; dictionaries of art, which may be concerned with craftsmanship and treat of technique or concerned with taste and deal with the elements of beauty; we realise that the name is legion, even of the classes among which they can be distributed. We also realise that the works thus arranged are so diverse in character that to group them together hardly serves any useful purpose. In fact, the term dictionary is so often misapplied and appropriated to books which have but little relation to diction, that the writer who uses it in an undefined sense can hardly hope to be understood.

Among the works so classed there is one type which is unmistakably authentic—the book which deals with the speech of a people, of a place, or of a time. Thus limited, the class of dictionaries is found to be singularly small. Antiquity has bequeathed to us only fragmentary records in this form. The Museum of the Greek Grammarian Callimachus, who flourished in the third century B.C., is commonly cited as the earliest example. But the work itself is lost and would seem to have been rather critical than lexicographical. We must come to the time of Augustus for the earliest work which appears to be concerned with the meanings of words—the *De significatione verborum* of Verrius Flaccus. Here again

the work itself is lost; but an abridgment made some four hundred years later by Pompeius Festus has survived, and in a form still further abridged by Paul Diacre has furnished important material to the modern Latin dictionary. Indeed, as Skeat has remarked, a dictionary, in the full sense of the word, was hardly possible before the era of printing. The value of a dictionary confined to the few copies which could be made by hand would be comparatively slight, and the labour of producing it, when private collections of books were small and libraries inaccessible, must have been enormous. The dictionary intended to serve the practical ends of instruction in the language treated, seems to have come into existence at Rome, when Greek literature and the Greek language became subjects of study to cultured Romans. We possess as examples of this type of work the 'Onomasticon' of Julius Pollux, the glossary of Attic authors of Harpocration, and a few others of a like kind.

It is significant that the Middle Ages have left practically nothing of this order. The Lexicon of Suidas and the Vocabularium of Papias are the principal examples, and it has been much debated whether Suidas lived in the days of the Roman Emperors or in the tenth or fourteenth century A.D. Of Papias it may indeed be said that he flourished in the eleventh century and laboured at the Latin dictionary; but it was the dictionary of a decayed Latin.

With the advent of the printing press a new interest in words arose, and was increased by the study, introduced at the Renaissance, of the ancient tongues, particularly of classical Greek and Latin. From this period the production of dictionaries received assiduous attention, and the names of Constantin, Scapula, Comenius, Schrevelius, Vossius, and finally of Forcellini, whose work is better known under the name of his coadjutor, Facciolati, are associated with the perfecting of the Greek and Latin dictionaries into complete expository treatises upon the language of the classic authors. The progress of this work gave an impulse—first felt in Italy—towards the refining and fixing in literary form of the current speech of modern Europe. Hence arose the great literary dictionaries in various

lands—the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* in Italy, in 1612; the *Dictionnaire de l'Academie Française*, 1694; and the *Dictionary of the Academia Española*, published at Madrid in 1726.

The same movement that produced these great dictionaries on the Continent, was active in this country, and found notable expression in various ways, among others in an open letter addressed in the year 1712 by Dean Swift to the Lord Treasurer Harley. Swift worked out and urged upon the Prime Minister the necessity of a scheme for the formation of an English Academy ‘to ascertain the English language and fix it for ever,’ so putting a term to that change in the forms of words and the idioms of speech which has rendered the English of the Middle Ages largely obsolete.

‘The rude Latin,’ Swift says, ‘of the monks is still very intelligible, whereas had their records been delivered down in the vulgar tongue so barren, so barbarous, so subject to continual and succeeding changes they could not now be understood, unless by antiquaries who make it their study to expound them. . . . If things go on at this rate, all I can promise your Lordship is that, about two hundred years hence, some painful compiler, who will be at the trouble of studying old language, may inform the world that, in the reign of Queen Anne, Robert, Earl of Oxford, a very wise and excellent man, was made High Treasurer and saved his country, which in those days was almost ruined by a foreign war and a domestic faction. Thus much he may be able to pick out and willing to transfer to his new history, but the rest of your character . . . will probably be dropped on account of the antiquated style and manner they are delivered in.’

The views which Swift here expresses with such humorous exaggeration were seriously held by him, by Pope, by Chesterfield, presumably also by Harley, to whom Swift commends them as to a sympathiser, and, with a difference, by Johnson himself. In the preface to his *Dictionary*, at the end of a dissertation on the mutability of English speech and its causes, Johnson says :

‘The great pest of speech is frequency of translation. No book was ever turned from one language into another without imparting something of its native idiom, this is the most

mischievous and comprehensive innovation, single words may enter by thousands and the fabric of the tongue continue the same, but new phraseology changes much at once, it alters not the single stones of the building but the order of the columns. If an Academy should be established for the cultivation of our style; which I, who can never wish to see dependence multiplied, hope the spirit of English liberty will hinder or destroy; let them instead of compiling grammars and dictionaries endeavour with all their influence to stop the license of translators whose idleness and ignorance, if it is suffered to proceed, will reduce us to babble a dialect of France.'

In point of scope and magnitude these classical dictionaries are, if not equal, at least fairly comparable with one another. For instance, the Italian dictionary comprises some 30,000 words in the approved vocabulary which is drawn from a series of 200 authors, running back to Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch. It was first published in 1612, and has been brought down by successive editions to our own times.

The French Dictionary, published first in 1694, comprises about the same number of words; the date to which its sources of diction are carried back is not ascertainable, as in the case of the Italian Dictionary, for the simple reason that the Academie has published no statement on the subject and has cited no authorities in support of its definitions. In his review of French literature, which serves as preface to the sixth edition of the book, M. Villemain, quoting the Abbé Dubos, places the dawn of the classic period of French literature in the middle of the 17th century. If we take that view of the age of modern French, we must set it down as junior to Italian by two hundred and fifty years, and of later date by one hundred and fifty years than Johnson's Classical English. By issuing revised editions at intervals the French Academy has brought its dictionary, as with the Italian, down to modern times. The French, however, have issued since 1835 not new editions of the classic work but 'Complements,' or, as we should say, 'Supplementary Volumes,' which comprise the current words omitted from the Dictionary proper. This work, a compromise between the classical and popular types of dictionary, is a hybrid of no great

value. Lacking etymology and illustrative quotations it is far inferior to Littré's Dictionary for general use, whereas the authority of the Academy, which is its distinctive feature, is of no value in a vocabulary of vulgar speech. It is the old dictionary of 1835 which alone among French dictionaries is interesting from our present point of view.

With this work Johnson's Dictionary is as comparable in point of performance as in respect of its design. The collection of words is, in later editions, more than equal in number to that of the French dictionary ; in the first edition it was somewhat fewer. It has been issued in successive editions down to our own time, the last edition being brought out by Latham in 1882.

Johnson's work, although comparable both for scale and finish to the Academy dictionaries, was carried through in much shorter time. His task was completed in seven years, while the Italian Academy took twenty, the French forty years, on the first editions of their respective works. The difference is to be explained by alteration of method. Johnson worked single-handed and under contract ; the Academicians proceeded in conference and under no pressure of time. There is a good story, to which Larousse gives credence, serving to illustrate the leisurely method of the Academicians. One hot summer day they had spent a morning debating the distinction between 'de suite' and 'tout de suite.' When the discussion showed signs of degenerating, the Abbé Boisrobert interposed with the suggestion, 'We are wasting a fine day, like monks in a scriptorium. Let us adjourn to an oyster bar that we know well and then renew the discussion with reinvigorated powers.' 'Agreed,' said the Academicians, and 'tout de suite' added Chapelaine. Accordingly they filed off to the Vendanges de Bourgogne, and Boisrobert gave the order for six dozen oysters 'de suite.' 'Oui, tout de suite,' added Conrart. 'Mais, Messieurs,' said the écaillère, 'si vous voulez que j'ouvre vos huîtres de suite, il m'est impossible de vous les servir tout de suite.' 'Agreed,' said the Academicians with one voice, and discovered that their difference had been resolved by the oyster seller. It may be believed that Johnson did not derive much

assistance in his task from his occasional relaxations ; but, on the other hand, he was not hampered by pertinacious objectors or long-winded disputations.

The apprehension of Swift and Johnson that the English language of their day was in danger of rapid degeneration seems to us unduly pessimistic. Reading, as we do, without difficulty, even without a sense of strangeness, the great literature of the Elizabethans, we may well consider that the English tongue had already, a hundred years before the time at which Johnson was writing, attained to such maturity as to be proof against serious corruption and decay. But it is, at least, possible that the case for Johnson's opinion was stronger than we are to-day prepared to realise. Four hundred years have elapsed since the date which Johnson fixed upon as the birthday of classical English literature. If we go back to a time equally remote from him we come to the years when Chaucer was writing the Canterbury Tales and Langland voicing the criticisms of Piers the Plowman. If the changes in literary English had been as rapid in the centuries succeeding Johnson as in the centuries preceding him, we should, most of us, be reading Shakespeare in translation, or not at all, and our Bible in the Authorised Version, instead of being the norm and exemplar of our daily speech, would have become by this time one of our antiquities. To prevent any such change as that, to fix the English speech upon the model of the 16th- and 17th-century writers, was the aim which Johnson and his employers had in view. It may be impossible to say in what measure his work has conducted to that result, for other things have been contributory to it in ways that are unmistakable, even if incalculable. But that Johnson's Dictionary has operated powerfully in that direction cannot be questioned. A few illustrative facts will make this clear.

In the first place, it may be noted that the want of a dictionary prior to Johnson's time was the most pronounced defect in English literature. Great writers had used the English tongue and produced an English literature fit, and in fact destined, to take rank among the foremost literatures of all time. But there were forces at work which tended to change the language so rapidly that Johnson, looking back, identified Gower, who was

writing in 1400, as the earliest author to employ a form of English readable in Johnson's day. How different from the case of Latin! True, the Latin of common use had undergone great changes since the Augustan Age. But those changes had not seriously affected Latin literature. It is true that 'dog latin' had changed the common speech, almost as greatly as the lapse of time had changed the idiom of Langland and of Gower. But a dictionary of classical Latin had preserved the literary language, so that although priests and lawyers might dispute in terms of *Latinitas infima*, scholars like Milton, and Johnson himself, could read and write the Latin of Cicero and Horace with the facility of the contemporaries of those classic authors. This was the consideration which had prompted the Barberini in Italy, Richelieu in France, and the booksellers of London, to set up machinery for the compilation of modern dictionaries on the model of the dictionary of classical Latin.

Again, it is to be noted that in his own day and down even to our time, Johnson's Dictionary has been in this sense the standard English Dictionary, serving its purpose even more perfectly than the *Dictionnaire de l'Academie* serves the purpose of an authoritative dictionary of the French tongue. Glossaries abounded, works on the Etymology of the English tongue were not wanting, when Johnson was commissioned to write the English Dictionary. But the glossaries were without authority and the Etymologies were destined to lapse, after a short vogue, into the class of literary curiosities. There was no work in the early part of the 18th century which could put a curb upon extravagance in the practice of innovation or serve as a basis upon which a code of English literary style could be established. To make provision of such a desideratum was the object which Johnson and his supporters set before themselves. And the measures taken to this end were wholly suitable. Johnson was not vain enough to set himself up as an impersonated English Academy. Instead of claiming for his text such authority as was enjoyed by the Dictionary of the French Academy, he supported his adjudications by the quotation of passages selected from writers of repute; and by a happy selection of extracts from his chosen authorities, he produced an array of authenticated

definitions of no less weight than those embodied in the officially sanctioned dictionaries of Italy and France. The success of such a scheme depended, of course, upon the choice of authorities; and on this point Johnson himself may be quoted. He writes:

'I have fixed upon Sidney's work as the boundary beyond which I make few excursions. From the authors which rose in the time of Elizabeth a speech might be formed adequate to all the purposes of use and elegance. If the language of theology were extracted from Hooker and the translation of the Bible, the terms of natural Knowledge from Bacon, the phrases of policy, war and navigation from Raleigh, the dialect of poetry and fiction from Spencer and Sidney, and the diction of common life from Shakespeare, few ideas would be lost to mankind for want of English words in which they might be expressed.'

The list of authors is not exhaustive. In fact, Johnson drew upon many more than he here enumerates. Any page of his dictionary will add a dozen names to the catalogue, so that the authors specified must be regarded only as specimens of the company of authors on which he drew. But it is easy, running over this short list of representative English writers, to understand the high authority which, from the moment of its publication, Johnson's book assumed in the public estimation. The object being to establish a literary standard which should command the respect and affect the style of the writers of the English tongue, this clearly was the way to accomplish that end, for, in any case of doubt, what writer of English would hesitate to accept the guidance of such masters of the language as Johnson here vouches for his definitions?

The argument may be carried farther, and it may be said that the classics whom Johnson accepted as such are English classics still. Their authority has suffered no diminution since Johnson's day, and no English writer of our own time would hesitate to apply to their work Johnson's description of it as a 'well of English undefiled.' To secure this result, to give a character of permanence to the English idiom of the 16th century, to bridle the innovator, to curb the affectation of foreign manners, to awaken the interest of English people in the English tongue—these were the objects that Johnson

pursued. Who will deny that these objects have been effectively secured? And if they have been secured, is it possible to doubt that among many contributory causes Johnson's Dictionary has been one, and a notably effective, cause?

On this point it is worthy of recognition that until the appearance of the Oxford Dictionary, Johnson's authority was not successfully disputed by any rival. This primacy, enjoyed for upwards of two hundred years, was not an unchallenged pre-eminence. In 1817, a serious attempt to dislodge Johnson from his pride of place was made by the publication, as part of the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, of Richardson's Dictionary. In this book the attempt was made to supersede Johnson's etymology and revise his authorities. Even before the days of Johnson, a bold attempt had been made by Dr John Wallis, a Savilian professor of Geometry at Oxford, to lay the foundations of a scientific system of etymology in the ground of phonetics. Being one of the founder-members of the Royal Society, Dr Wallis was entitled to do what he could to bring the science of etymology into the sphere of natural philosophy, and his book enjoyed for a long period a very great reputation. Johnson himself notices it—in the grammar by which his Dictionary is prefaced—with much more respect than any modern writer would show for its fanciful speculations, although Johnson criticises it as over-refined. But Wallis's theories, although not in the end justified, were much affected by later writers upon etymology; and, in 1786, they underwent at the hands of Horne Tooke a transformation which at the time was hailed as a revelation by the students of English Grammar. Wallis had striven to lay the foundations of an universal etymology in the inherent values of letters, considered as the elements of words. This, had it succeeded, would have turned etymology into one of the physical sciences. But the attempt did not prosper. Wallis laid a foundation; but after a hundred years people were coming to Johnson's conclusion that it was a foundation upon which no superstructure could be successfully raised. Then Horne Tooke made his new departure. Abandoning the attempt to make a physical science of etymology—general or English—he formulated a new scheme for

deriving English words, by a more or less complete system of inflexion, from a limited number of root words, and so establishing a rule not of classic but of normal English. Horne Tooke in his turn became no less famous than Wallis, and the author of the 'Diversions of Purley' was acclaimed as the philosopher who had divined the vital secret of English speech. Here then was the chance for a new dictionary. Johnson's was fifty years old. Everybody knew that it was faulty. Not a few of its definitions could obviously be improved upon. Had not its maker defined a daughter as 'the female offspring of a man *or* woman,' Excise as a 'hateful tax . . . adjudged by wretches hired by those to whom the tax is paid,' Pastern as 'the knee of a horse'? Had he not defined Windward and Leeward in identical terms and, with a humour something wanting perhaps in urbanity, and undoubtedly lacking in solemnity, explained that Oats is 'a grain which in England is generally given to horses but in Scotland supports the people'? Richardson proposed not only to remedy such obvious defects, but to revise the definitions thoroughly on the principle of tracing in every word the noun which he assumed to be its original and prototype. But, most important of all, he would recast the etymology and mould it to Horne Tooke's model; and, while retaining Johnson's principle of adducing the classic English writers as authorities for his definitions, would improve the collection of such authorities by addition and revision.

Here, it might be supposed, was the rival work which would supersede Johnson's Dictionary. To us to-day, indeed, its chief claim to pre-eminence—its systematic etymology—seems to be no merit but a fault. Johnson's *flair* was sounder than Richardson's science; but Richardson's contemporaries did not take that view. They accorded to his speculations the same sort of enthusiastic reception which in our day is commonly accorded to scientific novelties. For the rest, the improvements introduced by Richardson were real and considerable. The work had a temporary vogue, but it did not take the place of Johnson's Dictionary or supersede it in the end. After a short period, the later editions of Johnson displaced Richardson upon the reference shelf and relegated it to the old-book store. A few years sufficed

to see 'Johnson' installed once more as the dictionary of the English language.

A more or less similar account may be given of the other attempts to dispute Johnson's pre-eminence. Webster's Dictionary, written for the American market, has never been a rival, although successive editions have kept it up to date to the present time. Its author aimed at comprehensiveness, not at discrimination. In 1850, Ogilvies' Dictionary, based on Webster but published in Edinburgh, made the later results of philological studies available for the purposes of English Etymology, and on the basis which it laid the still later and larger 'Century' Dictionary appeared, forty years afterwards. But these books, like the still larger collections published by the American firm of Funk and Wagnalls, were frankly comprehensive and not critical in their treatment of words. They were based upon the principle laid down by Archbishop Trench in 1857, that a dictionary should be an inventory of the language, that it is no task of the maker to select the good words, the business which he has undertaken is to collect and arrange all the words, whether good or bad. All these comprehensive dictionaries are now definitely superseded by the Oxford Dictionary, which exhibits the language of English literature in all its breadth with a completeness that has never before been attempted, and seems unlikely ever to be bettered. This, however, is a totally different thing from a dictionary of classical English, designed to give permanance to the idiom and to arrest or protract the ageing process which renders words and forms of speech in time obscure and eventually obsolete. To make a comprehensive vocabulary of a language which was undergoing rapid change would be a work of supererogation.

This point may be illustrated by a reference to our own law dictionaries and by a comparison of two such analogous works as Cowell's Interpreter of 1607 and Stroud's Judicial Dictionary of 1903 (2nd Edition). Both of them aim at comprehensiveness within the limits of a law lexicon; but in the earlier work are to be found hundreds of terms which have been omitted from the later—Dimes and Cocket, Bull and Champion, words so obsolete in the legal sense as to be without interest

to the lawyer of to-day. The language of the law is comparatively steadfast. Such words as Writ, Party, Power, and Debt are heirlooms from before the Norman Conquest; but, as compared with the English of our classic writers, the language of the law is fugitive. The Law Reports which Plowden and Coke were compiling when Spenser and Shakespeare were writing poetry would be unintelligible in a modern Court of Law, and although they are quoted to-day they are only quoted in translation. It may be confessed that the language of literature was not threatened in Johnson's time with any such catastrophe as has overtaken the language of the law, and it can hardly be doubted that some stronger barrier than taste or authority could interpose, must have operated to fix the speech of the 18th and 19th centuries on the model of the 17th.

It may be surmised that the most powerful influence of that kind is the multiplication of printed books and wide diffusion of the practice of reading them. The printed word is the great preserver of verbal forms. In the first place, it gives rise to a standard spelling which is much more easily enforced upon the compositor than on the scribe. The slips of the scribe cannot be so easily detected or set right as the mistakes of the compositor, for his manuscript is not submitted in proof but comes into existence in its final form. It is only the close attention and accomplished skill of the scribe which keeps his work clear of error, whereas the work of the compositor is revised before being printed off. Furthermore, the scribe economises labour and material by a liberal use of abbreviations of which the compositor is much more sparing. And abbreviations greatly relax the rigour of the rule of spelling. Hence, in these later centuries, the printed word has entered as a powerful preservative influence into our ordinary speech. It is worthy of remark that in Johnson's time the printed word counted for much less than it does now. Not only was the cost of printing greater and the habit of reading much less widely diffused than now; the proof-reading was far less efficient than it is to-day. In fact, the conservative power of the printer is a force which has been growing from the days of Gutenberg and Caxton, and in future will probably never be less than it is

to-day. This force we may with good reason trust to preserve the tradition of which the printer is the depositary and so to operate more powerfully than any academy, however authoritative, or any writer, how great so ever his vogue and abiding his fame. This view has indeed received notable expression very recently, for in May the tidings came that the Italian Government had resolved to withdraw the subvention by which the Accademia della Crusca has been supported during its three centuries of activity and to dismiss its members, thus bringing the publication of the *Vocabolario* to an end.

While the printer can do much to preserve our vocabulary intact, he can do little or nothing to protect the idiom against change. In this department the tradition is embodied in the spoken word. It is fortunate that common speech is more tender of the syntax than of the orthography of the tongue. The most illiterate speaker will use the auxiliaries 'shall' and 'will' with perfect propriety and, although no one arrives without painstaking attention at the correct spelling or correct pronunciation of the English language, the niceties of idiomatic speech are mastered usually without conscious effort, when mastered they are. It is in this department that the work of the lexicographer is most important. By recording idiomatic forms of speech he preserves them, not indeed in knowledge, for unless the occasion for their use persisted they would drop out of recollection, however conscientiously recorded. But he preserves their form intact. For example, there is no obvious reason why the phrase 'for good and all' should denote finality. The phrase is as hard to construe when we first meet it, in the early 17th century, as it is to-day. Its meaning must have been as definitely fixed then as it is now, and it was fixed in the same sense. Congreve used it in the year 1693, and then repeatedly used it, and treated it as a phrase which had crystallised into a compound word. In such a case, it is easy to suppose that the value of a dictionary record in preserving the idiomatic form must be considerable. Possibly, this phrase in the whole course of its history, has never been so unfamiliar as to cause any writer to fall into uncertainty as to its

terms. But the hypothesis of doubt is by no means unimaginable. For example, the phrase 'for good and bad' puts the meaning just as well as 'for good and all.' Indeed, in the slightly modified form, 'for better, for worse,' it has, with the same meaning, obtained an established place in our marriage service. Let such a contingency be supposed, then, and a writer confused between 'for good and all' and 'for good and bad.' It would be far easier for him to set his doubt at rest by looking up the phrase in his dictionary than by hunting it up in unindexed literature. Even if his memory so far served as to enable him to go to Congreve or to L'Estrange in quest of it, the search might still be impracticably tedious. But the matter does not bear argument. Clearly the dictionary is a much better custodian than the literary book, and more trustworthy in some cases than the traditions of oral speech.

It may be possible to-day to say that the Academy Dictionary is a thing of the past, and that the chronicler of words, not their critic, must henceforth preside over the work of dictionary-making. If that be so, it is because it is also true,

‘That men may rise on stepping stones  
Of their dead selves to higher things.’

Johnson's Dictionary is superseded to-day mainly because the great forces to which we have referred—the activity of the printing press, the wide diffusion of our tongue, and of the habit of reading, the solid establishment of our classic literature in the thought and affection of a vast population scattered in every portion of the habitable globe—these things have given a root to the language of the Bible and of Shakespeare which no other language has ever won in the usage and traditions of mankind. But the striking fact which emphasises the point is, as has been already suggested, the appearance of the Oxford Dictionary. Since its inception at the Philological Society more than fifty years have passed; its vocabulary carries back over seven hundred years. To its illustration 5000 authors have been made contributory; the collaborators who have shared the burden of the gigantic effort number more than 1300; their combined efforts have resulted in a collection of

3,500,000 illustrative extracts to serve as the raw material of the work. Its basis, as might easily be supposed from the mere enumeration of these figures, is out of all proportion broad by comparison with that of any other lexicon. The great Grimm Dictionary of the German tongue affords, perhaps, the closest parallel. But here the contrast is more striking than the resemblance. Of Grimm's Dictionary the first volume, carrying the vocabulary to the word Bier-molke, appeared in 1854 ; the thirteenth, and at present the latest, volume in 1922. The great philologists whose name it bears, the brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, produced only the first two volumes. Nine editors in chief have carried on the work during the sixty years elapsed since Jakob Grimm's death. It is an inevitable consequence that the work should exhibit great inequalities. The study of language owes much of its present completeness to the brothers Grimm ; but it has not stagnated, consequently, the later volumes exhibit the marks of later learning when compared with the earlier. Besides this want of uniform quality, the work, although equally comprehensive with the English Dictionary, covers a smaller literary field. The list of authors upon whom the brothers Grimm drew for their vocabulary comprised not more than 1300 names and ranges back in date to Luther, thus covering a period of about 450 years as against the 700 years included in the programme of the promoters of the Oxford Dictionary. The actual entries in the Wörterbuch when it is completed will be more numerous, probably, even than those of the Oxford Dictionary, but comparison on such lines is very difficult to make. The system of word formation—that is to say, the formation of combinations which pass for words—is so different in German from what it is in English or in French, that the statistical comparison is unmeaning. Such expressions as ship-master, good-for-nothing, catch-as-catch-can, would be commonplace words in German ; they are notably exceptional in English.

It is by the literary range, the careful dating of the birth of words, the systematic tracing down of changes in form and meaning—in a word, it is, by the completeness with which the English language is represented in

the Oxford Dictionary that its pre-eminence rests. In comparison with that, Grimm's Dictionary affords only a cursory and imperfect view of German speech; and any other dictionary that could be named, of whatever living language, makes but a poor showing when compared with Grimm. Furthermore, the English Dictionary bears in a striking manner the impress of one controlling mind, notwithstanding the long period which its production has occupied and the risk which such protracted preparation involves of changes in the editorial control. Sir James Murray signed the preface to the first volume in April 1888. He died in July 1915, having been actively engaged upon the dictionary to the last, some portion of the work which had passed his hand being unprinted at the time of his death. The three editors who have carried on the work since his death were all associated with Sir James as co-editors while he was acting as editor in chief. One of them, Dr Henry Bradley, had been associated with him from the first. The announcement of Dr Bradley's death, which appeared in May, illustrates, with poignant emphasis, the risk above referred to. But the work is too far advanced now to be imperilled by the withdrawal of one of the collaborateurs, however distinguished personally and however completely identified with the undertaking he may have been. The other two, Dr W. A. Craigie and Mr C. T. Onions, have long been connected with the publication. Thus this work bears in a striking way the character of coherence, notwithstanding the long period of incubation and the large number of its contributors. Alike in plan and execution it must be pronounced without an equal among dictionaries.

Fifty years ago, when interest in the project of this great work was beginning to spread from the Philological Society and its immediate supporters to wider circles of the British public, the plan of the work was made the subject of discussion by the late Sir E. B. Tylor in this Review.\*

'To judge,' said he, 'from Mr Furnivall's last reports of the position of the undertaking, which give the state of the sub-editing, letter by letter, it appears that this work, preparatory to the actual elaboration of the dictionary, may

\* 'Quarterly Review,' October 1873, Vol. 135, p. 462.

now be half or three-quarters done, but is almost at a stand. The question which arises is not so much, "When will the great work be done?" as, "Will it ever be done?" in our time at least. An effort as great, or greater than that which started the New English Dictionary fourteen years ago, will be needed to complete it fourteen years hence. Let us hope that, whether under the present or some new plan, English energy and skill will carry the undertaking through.'

We now know that both energy and skill were forthcoming, but that the effort was to be far greater than Sir Edward Tylor supposed, and we know also that the result is such as to be commensurate to the effort.

The interest of a dictionary is not exhausted when we have ascertained its contribution to literature and literary education. As with all the works of man it bears the impress of its maker's hand, and throws light upon the working of his mind. Reference has been made to well-known slips in Johnson's Dictionary. Other lexicographers have been no more free from the lapses which arise from inattention or the limitation which Johnson called 'pure ignorance.' A striking example was Webster's original definition of a Wicket-Keeper as 'the player at Cricket who stands with a bat to protect the wicket from a ball.' If not to pure ignorance, at least to gross inadvertence the slip was due by which in the *Dictionnaire de l'Academie* an eclipse was defined as 'the disappearance of a heavenly body due to the interposition of a celestial object between it and the observer.' In criticism of this definition, Arago caustically remarked that for upwards of 3000 years astronomers had made a practice of observing the eclipsed moon with no celestial object between themselves and it. Want of a judicious reserve in limiting his definitions to what was necessary led Phillips into a trap when he defined a quaver as 'the half of a crotchet, as a crotchet is the half of a quaver.' But it is not by such unconscious humour only that the maker of a dictionary becomes a minister to our delight. There is ample opportunity for a light touch and pleasant fancy in the selection and handling of illustrative quotations. Such opportunities present themselves sometimes unexpectedly; for example, something more than a desire to illustrate the meaning of the word 'hazard' must

have prompted the selection for the Oxford Dictionary of the following quotation from old Thomas Browne, 'When a sick man leaves all to nature to do he hazards much, when he leaves all to the doctor to do he hazards more.'

It is, however, in connexion with familiar words and pre-eminently with dialect that such selections most abound, and in the case of a work such as Prof. Joseph Wright's 'Dialect Dictionary,' they may be said to constitute much of the value of the work itself. Thus we have as an example of one of the dialects of the Midlands, 'Flapper'—a young partridge just able to fly, applied in joke to a girl of the 'bread-and-butter age.' Typical of Irish fancy is the use made in Antrim of the word 'feeding' to describe a fine drizzle of rain on a summer evening as a 'feeding of drooth.' Not so vivacious, but still typical, is the rustic wit of Somersetshire expressed in calling another a 'Zebín zided fuller.' 'How's make out that?' is the usual inquiry by the unwary. The bucolic answer is, 'Why, there's thy vore zide an' back zide, thy right zide an' left zide, thy inzide and outzide, and then there's thy blind zide, s'now.'

But it can hardly be overbold to hazard the opinion that the human interest of the dictionary has never been quite so systematically or successfully cultivated as in Mr Weekley's 'Etymological Dictionary of Modern English.' A rebel against pedantry, its author offers his book

'to those lovers of our language who, without wishing to stumble about the dim regions which produce prehistoric roots and conjectural primitive teutonic word forms, have an educated interest in words and an intelligent curiosity as to their origins and earlier senses.'

Having thus made choice of his public he provides them with very palatable manna. 'What is it?' was the inquiry with which the Israelites greeted the food which they found ready to their hand in the desert. 'What is it?' is the question with which the reader of Mr Weekley's vivacious preface will turn from it to his lexicon. A short inspection will satisfy him that both scholarship and industry are embodied there in very readable disquisition. A light but trenchant criticism, for instance, is conveyed in the definition

of 'internecine' which is correctly given as 'deadly'; while its misuse by modern writers in the sense of intestine, almost common enough to amount to inveterate error and a secondary sense, is traced to its origin in the explanation—'Modern sense is due to erroneous explanation of "mutually destructive" in Johnson.' Johnson's slip has been perpetuated by most English lexicographers. Richardson, indeed, made the necessary correction but Ogilvie relapsed. Webster, who gives the correct meaning as the primary sense, adopts Johnson's definition as a secondary meaning. Less accurate, his American successor, Worcester, adopts Johnson's definition as the primary meaning of the word. It is significant of careful editing that the Century Dictionary gives the correct definition without any reference to Johnson's slip; but it is striking evidence of the influence of Johnson's work on English literature that a mere lapse on his part should so permeate the modern language.

No less interesting in its precise detail is the following etymological notice of the word 'pantechnicon.' 'Coined (1830) from G. πᾶν and τέχνη, relating to the arts, as name of a bazaar in Motcomb Street, Belgrave Square, which was later converted into a storehouse for furniture. Now usually short for *pantehnicon van*.' Another instance of Mr Weekley's erudition must bring our quotations to an end even at the risk of leaving the reader to find out for himself the full answer to the question, 'What is it?' Duly registered as a new English word appears Sinn Fein traced back to 1882 as the title of an Irish play by T. S. Cleary. 'Already,' we are informed, i.e. since Easter 1916, 'the phrase has become current abroad,' and for that statement a French writer is avouched who, in the crisis of France's fate at the date named, applied it as a term of reproach to the traitors who were watching for a chance to stab in the back the nation fighting for its life at Verdun.

With all his limitations the lexicographer may fairly say with old Chremes, 'Humani nihil a me alienum puto.'

J. W. GORDON.

## Art. 12.—THE DOLE AND DEMORALISATION.

1. *Petition with regard to the increased expenditure on Public Assistance presented to the Prime Minister on Jan. 28, 1923, and correspondence with Mr Stanley Baldwin, M.P., as Chancellor of the Exchequer.*
2. *Third Annual Report of the Ministry of Health. (Cmd. 1713. 1922.)*
3. *Reports of Official Enquiries into the Expenditure of the Sheffield and Poplar Guardians, 1922.*  
And other Official Documents.

THERE is no more pressing problem in practical politics than that of the expenditure on public assistance. There is none that most of our statesmen and politicians are more unwilling to face. In English home politics, from time immemorial, the two questions that have mainly occupied English statesmen are the maintenance of a sound system of finance, and of a strong and efficient Navy. On these two problems the expenditure on direct public assistance threatens to have a disastrous influence. There is a third problem of a moral nature, and that is the maintenance of the national characteristics, a sound, honest, and efficient people, full of initiative, self-help, self-reliance, and, if need be, self-sacrifice. Here again the expenditure in question threatens national disaster. A century ago, immediately after Waterloo, the country was faced with similar difficulties. Relatively speaking, there was the same financial position, and the same position of demoralisation in regard to public assistance. Between 1815 and 1834 the nation looked on in a kind of paralysis at the inordinate growth of moral abuses and industrial disaster, and of ruinous expenditure. Committees were appointed and reported, but nothing was done.

Expenditure on public assistance had increased from 2,000,000*l.* in 1783 to 4,269,000*l.* in 1803 and 7,870,800*l.* in 1817 for a population of 11,000,000, that is, an expenditure of 14*s.* per head. The direct burden for the year ending March 25, 1832, amounted to 7,036,968*l.*, and in addition the waste from the labour rate and roundsman system of employment was estimated at a further

7,000,000*l.*, so that the total all told amounted to something like 20*s.* per head of the population of 14,000,000. In 1834 there were two Commissions on the Poor Laws. The first reported and laid down the following principles : (1) That the recipient of public charity (in a blunter age called a pauper *tout court*) should not have a position more eligible than that of the independent labourer of the most poorly paid class. (2) That while destitution must be relieved by the State, destitution must be proved in the case of able-bodied persons by the test of willingness to enter the work-house. (3) The appointment of a central board to centralise knowledge and to frame and enforce regulations as to the distribution of relief and uniformity of accounts. (4) That while knowledge and supervision should be centralised, power should be localised, since local knowledge was of the essence of sound administration in public assistance. The reforms above suggested were carried out by the second Commission which was appointed under the Act of Parliament of the same year. The unemployed were speedily absorbed. In two years the number of the able-bodied paupers in 12 Poor Law Unions decreased from 3512 to 5. Economies followed so that in 1871 the expenditure had fallen to 7*s.* per head of the population, although in addition to the old expenditure new and costly institutions, such as asylums, infirmaries, and district schools, had been provided.

Moreover, within the same time a moral reformation had taken place. The working men came to trust their own initiative and self-reliance, and had in their Friendly Societies, Trades Unions, Building Societies, and Co-operative Societies, provided a practical solution for various sections of the social problem. For instance, provision was made against sickness, accident, old age, and unemployment by insurance, for arbitration and conciliation in industrial strife, as well as for facilitating the purchase of their own dwellings by the working classes, and facilitating the purchase at a reasonable price and of good quality of such necessities as food and clothing. Further, there was not only associated thrift but private thrift; and this prevailed to such an extent that at the end of the century the working classes, the first generation of which had been almost entirely dependent on the rates,

had amassed in various forms of thrift and self-help capital estimated by good authorities to amount to between 350 and 400 millions sterling, of which about 300 millions can be definitely earmarked in various institutions. In Mr Gladstone's words, the Poor Law Reform of 1834 'rescued the English peasantry from the total loss of their independence.'

Roughly speaking, up to 1890 the old provisions with regard to public assistance, known as the Poor Law, prevailed; and it was possible to tell by reference to accurate statistics what proportion of the population was living by their own exertions and what proportion were dependent on public relief. Since then, owing to certain sentimental and political causes, the system of public assistance for every conceivable object has been introduced. This is due, in so far as the politicians are concerned, to a desire for popularity at any price, and in the general public to a certain sloppiness of sentiment and lack of clear thinking, and in the majority of the recipients of the benefits to a certain want of grit, initiative, and self-respect; in other words, to a certain flabbiness of character which is always latent in human nature, but which can be encouraged or discouraged by the legislator. Till within the last quarter of a century dependence on the State has been a disappearing factor, but now it has reappeared in all its force. It is a chronic disease, for the same cases come back again and again for public assistance. It is hereditary in certain families from generation to generation, and is contagious. When a relieving officer has been to one house in a street he has to come again to others. Poor people will apply for what they believe to be their share in an inexhaustible fund intended especially for them; and if they have ever contributed to the rates they think they are only getting back their own money. Average human nature is not proof against the common desire to live without labour. During the Victorian era a test of well-being in a country was held to consist in the maximum of independence and the minimum of dependence on the public funds. In a letter to the 'Daily Telegraph' on May 30, 1921, in support of an article of mine in the same paper, the writer pointed out that twenty years ago, although he lived in a poor street in the East End of London

where all were poor, it was felt to be a degradation for a man or a member of his family to be in receipt of public assistance.\*

The first breach in the reforms introduced by the Poor Law Commission of 1834 was effected in 1886 by the transfer of the relief of some of the able-bodied poor in the shape of the unemployed from the Guardians to other authorities. The second was the remission of school fees by the Education Act of 1890, which was advocated, amongst other reasons, to give the poor more money to clothe and feed their children. After 1890 came a halt, due perhaps to the exhaustive report of the Royal Commission on Labour which showed to what extent the material and moral well-being of the working classes had improved thanks to their own efforts, and the good hope existing that if the wholesome development and progress was allowed to continue the unskilled classes would solve their own problems as the skilled classes had done.

At the beginning, however, of the new century, from 1900 onwards, new views prevailed. In 1905, the Unemployed Workmen's Act was carried; in 1906, the Education (Provision of Meals to Children) Act; in 1907, the Educational Administrative Provisions Act, giving free medical attendance to children; in 1908, the Old Age Pensions Act; and in 1911 the National Health Insurance Act, which was followed by the National Insurance for Unemployment. The problem, therefore, was not due to the War of 1914-18, although that war has aggravated it by new economic conditions which have pressed heavily on certain branches of highly skilled labour, and concealed it in other cases, for instance, by new forms of malingering. The war has been followed by the new development of the Housing Acts, the extension of the unemployment dole, and the increasing overlapping and confusion of accounts. The figures can be given as far as they are now available for the United Kingdom: 1890, 25,000,000*l.*, including 12,500,000*l.* for

---

\* History has repeated itself, for an old labourer stated to the Commission of 1834 that when he was young, 'If any man applied to the parish he was pointed at by all who knew him as a *parish bird*, but it was very different now.' First Report, p. 69. Formerly 'a man would rather starve than apply,' p. 73.

Education; 1901, 39,000,000*l.*; 1911, 69,000,000*l.*; 1919, 173,000,000*l.*, according to a return which will be alluded to directly but which is defective and includes figures as old as 1917; and for the year ending March 31, 1921, 332,000,000*l.*, so far as can be ascertained from Parliamentary statements, including 99,000,000*l.* for War Pensions and 97,200,000*l.* for Education; while the figures for the year ending March 31, 1922, reach the appalling total for the United Kingdom of 400,000,000*l.* sterling from public funds, excluding 30,000,000*l.* received from contributions, fees, etc. The Secretary of the Treasury stated in mitigation of these figures that the population of the United Kingdom had increased from 38,000,000 in 1891 to 47,000,000 at present, and that the increase in wages and prices rendered such services twice as costly, but he also said it was idle to pretend the money could not be better spent.\* Exact and accurate statements are wanting; but, taking these figures as they stand, in the year ending March 31, 1921, it looks as if there was an expenditure of 6*l.* 17*s.* 4*d.* per head of the population, or subtracting Education, an expenditure of 4*l.* 17*s.* 4*d.* per head, and for the year ending March 31, 1922, an expenditure of 8*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* per head, Education included.

The vast expenditure of 400,000,000*l.* above mentioned has to be met from the rates and taxes, that is, from State and local taxation. English State finance formerly depended chiefly on indirect taxation. Now it has come to depend chiefly on direct taxation; and direct taxation, according to a great authority, has been carried to a point at which it has become a serious handicap to commercial enterprise, and consequently the immediate cause of unemployment. The signs that direct taxation has become excessive were given in the January number of the 'Quarterly.'

In addition to this, there is the burden of local taxation. This burden has increased enormously and, apart from State taxation, is having a prejudicial effect upon industry. An enquiry was recently held by the Ministry of Health at Sheffield at the request of the local manufacturers, who were alarmed at the rise of

---

\* Hansard, April 4, 1922.

the rates, and the effect thereof on the power of the local industry to compete in the open market. The report of the enquiry, dated Feb. 5, 1923, mentions on page 3 a statement handed in on behalf of Messrs Vickers which contains an analysis showing that, 'after allowing for increased rateable value and reduced production, the cost per ton included 1*l.* 14*s.* 3*d.* attributable to rates in the two half-years ended Sept. 30, 1922, against 4*s.* in the two half-years ended March 31, 1913.' The practical effect of such increase was brought out by Sir Arthur Hobson, who stated that, 'as a matter of fact profits did not now exist, and salaries had been reduced to the lowest figure so that all that remained to meet the increased charges was the wages fund.' In this connexion it should be added that the last report of the Ministry of Health \* reminds us that 'the burden of pauperism falls directly or indirectly with principal weight upon the poorer wage-earners.'

Before going more closely into this expenditure I may at once define direct public assistance as comprising all beneficiary assistance from the rates and taxes for maintenance or treatment for which the recipient does not pay or only pays a portion. This expenditure which was, as we have seen, formerly under one heading of Poor Law Relief, is now camouflaged in the statistics of various branches of the administration, and disguised as education, public health, or the reward of industry on the plea that the causes of pauperism are being dissected. To put the definition in a concrete form, the Acts of Parliament under which this expenditure takes place fall under nine main heads: (1) The Acts relating to the relief of the poor; (2) Old Age Pensions Act; (3) the Education Act, 1890, and the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, 1907, and the Administrative Provisions Act, 1908; (4) Public Health Acts (*a*) as to hospitals and treatment of disease, (*b*) as to maternity and child welfare; (5) the National Health Insurance Acts; (6) the War Pensions Acts and Ministry of Pensions Acts; (7) the Housing of the Working Classes Acts; (8) the Unemployed Workmen's Act; (9) the Unemployed Insurance Acts.

The above Acts are administered by various and

---

\* (Cmd. 1713) 1922, p. 83.

unconnected public departments, such as the Ministry of Health, on its public health, Housing, Poor Law, and National Health Insurance sides; the Board of Customs and the Post Office for Old Age Pensions; the Ministry of Labour; the Ministry of Pensions; the Education Department; and, for the purpose of land settlement, the Ministry of Agriculture. Of these departments the Ministry of Pensions and the Ministry of Labour have each divided England and Wales into new administrative districts distinct from those (1) of the Poor Law Unions, and (2) the National Health administration. This has been done without the knowledge of the general public, and one shrewdly suspects that neither House of Parliament would have let the innovation pass without protest if it had known or understood. The result is that there are separate areas (*a*) for Poor Law administration and audit purposes, with distinct administrative control; (*b*) different divisional and inspectorial areas for National Health Insurance and audit purposes, not to mention different districts again for pricing prescriptions; (*c*) different areas and regions of control for War Pensions; (*d*) different areas and divisional control for Labour Exchanges and Unemployment Insurance; (*e*) separate areas for education and inspectorial control, while Old Age Pensions are administered in areas decided by the Customs. All these areas have, of course, separate battalions of officials with separate regulations, and all these areas and jurisdictions deal with direct public assistance, and constitute spheres of administration withdrawn from the purview of the High Court of Justice, subject to a system of administrative law which has grown up for the most part within the last twenty years. I have omitted any reference to sub-areas for audit and sectional purposes; but taking the system as it stands, how can it find supporters outside Bedlam?

It should be added that information as to these administrative areas is difficult to obtain, and the departments, with staffs in some cases admittedly unduly swollen and overpaid,\* appear to be despotic, sitting like the Cyclops in Homer on different mountains and paying no heed to each other. Neither the Pensions Depart-

\* Cp. Reports of House of Commons Estimates Committee on Board of Education and Labour Department, 1922.

ment, nor the Labour Department, nor the Customs Department, nor National Health Insurance desire to have anything to do with the Poor Law, the crutch on which the whole system depends. The result is that there is no central control, and, as a rule, no common action locally between the many competing authorities. Hence it is not possible to form any accurate idea of the amount spent on direct public assistance in any one year, or any estimate of future expenditure, still less to form any common policy to promote efficiency and eliminate overlapping and waste.

We have given not only a concise definition of direct public assistance with which we are dealing, but have enumerated the Acts of Parliament with which it is concerned and the central authorities under which it is administered, but it should perhaps be added that Education is included apart from these Acts because of the change which has taken place in the interpretation of that term. The London County Council, for instance, long ago made arrangements to remit the charges of meals to children under the Act of 1906 in necessitous cases, and it was stated in the Council's Report for 1910 that, 'Necessitous children are not necessarily ill-nourished at the time of application though they would become so were relief withheld.' The change of principle is definitely set out in the Report. 'Formerly education was in the main confined (1) to growth of character, (2) to the growth of the mind. Now it looks increasingly at the solution of the social problems which present themselves for solution in the case of the individual child, the problem of physical deterioration, of under-feeding, impoverished homes, and unsuitable employment.' That is to say, the educational system has to this extent become part and parcel of the Poor Law, no word being said about the duties of the parents.

War Pensions have been included because they are inextricably intertwined with the Poor Law. They must, of course, be distinguished from other forms of relief, because they are in the nature of reward for services rendered, or compensation for injuries received. They include payments 'to widows and dependants who, but for the prevailing depression, might have been in employment,' and, 'in the aggregate they must be contributing

to the relief of unemployment though this was not their reason and purpose.\*

If the central authorities for public assistance have been multiplied the same is true to a greater degree of the local authorities, amongst whom should be named the Guardians of the Poor, the County Council, the local Pensions Committee, the Labour Exchange, the Insurance Committee, the Distress Committee where such exists, the local Health authority, the local War Pensions Committee, and for some purposes, e.g. housing, the Parish Council. It will be clear without further explanation that the above services constitute direct public assistance as distinct from indirect public assistance, such as sanitation, drainage, public libraries, public baths and washhouses, or grants in aid to agricultural rates and other trade bounties. Further, we must distinguish direct public assistance from protective services such as factory legislation, mines legislation, and so forth. Direct public assistance is, in fact, the application of public funds to the supply of certain private wants which self-respect in the past has induced and should still induce the private person to endeavour to provide for by his own exertion.

The main features of the present system and the abuses to which it is liable began to appear at the end of 1912, when it became evident that Old Age Pensions, National Health Insurance, and the Labour Exchanges were overlapping with the Poor Law. In 1913, with the assistance of Members on both sides of the House of Commons, I obtained a statement from Mr Burns, showing the figures of direct beneficiary assistance in certain services for England and Wales. The Return, which became known in Parliament and elsewhere as the Drage Return, was issued from time to time during the War, and on Dec. 17, 1917, the Denison House Committee on Public Assistance was formed with myself as Chairman in order to obtain an extension of the Return and other reforms set out below. The Committee was instituted to promote efficiency and eliminate waste in the expenditure on direct public assistance, and to counteract

---

\* 'The Third Winter of Unemployment,' p. 50, cp. p. 9, 'In many cases also War Pensions are preventing distress that a pre-war depression would have brought.'

the prevailing wave of sentiment against deterrence from accepting public relief. It was pointed out by the Chairman in his opening address that :

'The Treasury had been for many years entirely unable to obtain from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the necessary support. The Chancellor cannot get support from the Cabinet, and the Cabinet cannot get support from the House of Commons. The real ground fact is that the House of Commons in its turn does not get any support from the country, so that it is really the electorate and not the Treasury who are in fact to blame for the extraordinary wave of extravagance which has swept and is sweeping over the country. The first service this Committee can render is to combat extravagance and to create an atmosphere in which economy predominates.'

By May 1918 the movement obtained such wide and influential support that we ventured to approach the then President of the Local Government Board, Mr Hayes Fisher, afterwards Lord Downham, and on receiving from him a favourable reply, and at his suggestion, we approached the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr Bonar Law, asking for certain extensions of the return. In speaking to the deputation on May 5, Mr Hayes Fisher said that :

'when he came to consider their request he could not understand that it should be opposed by any section of political life, or indeed by the community. The Committee did not necessarily condemn any items of expenditure, but asked that their precise cost should be stated in order to ascertain the proportion of people deriving benefit and in what proportion . . . they were paying for it. . . . Without such information it was not possible to weigh the value of any item of expenditure in comparison with another. . . . When we came to the end of the War we should want this statistical information more than ever if we were to have any Budgets framed with due regard to what was and what was not possible. . . . They had better concentrate their endeavours on current or at all events recent expenditure, for incomplete and inaccurate returns would be of no use. In face of the enormous taxation which the country would have to meet the great programme of reconstruction and all the financial difficulties which must gravely affect the judgment of the Commons as to what could be done in the way of reform of taxation; in the face of these difficulties the information asked for—which in his

opinion could to a large extent be given—would form a most valuable basis for constructive financial legislation. He would do his best to assist the deputation in obtaining the information.'

Mr Bonar Law wrote on June 19:

'In reply to your letter, while I certainly hope and expect that after the War a return of the nature you suggest can be given, I do not think I should be justified in saying more at present. The issue of the Drage Return is rather a matter for the Local Government Board . . . efforts will be made to issue statements giving such figures as are accessible. After the War the Local Government would hope to make the return as complete as possible.'

'The Times' wrote in a leading article on May 6, 1918:

'We do not see how any one can oppose the request on principle. It simply asks for information about a large branch of public expenditure put in such a form that people can understand what is being done with their money and what the national and local commitments are. The only ground on which we can imagine opposition to be raised is that the proposal is a veiled attack on the expenditure of money on public assistance at all. But such a construction would be an additional argument for the proposal. It would imply that the expenditure on public assistance will not bear exposure to the light of day, for only on that hypothesis can the return asked for constitute anything like an attack.'

In response to our requests the return was made annual, and various extensions were added from year to year; but it still remained very incomplete, and in consequence we made, on Jan. 28, 1923, a further petition to the Prime Minister, which was signed by about 300 persons possessed of special knowledge and long practical experience, including ex-Cabinet Ministers, Privy Councillors, Members of Parliament, Lords Lieutenant, Chairmen of County Councils, Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, Chairmen of Boards of Guardians, Chairmen of Chambers of Commerce, and other influential people. In this petition and in subsequent correspondence with Mr Stanley Baldwin, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, now Prime Minister, we asked: For a complete and up-to-date return of expenditure on direct public assistance.

The existing return is incomplete. It does not give, for instance, the whole of the expenditure of the Labour Department on direct Public Assistance, amounting in 1920-21 to 35,000,000*l.* and to 79,000,000*l.* in round numbers for 1921-22. In fact, the total amount recorded in the Return 139. 1922, for unemployed expenditure is 9,700,000*l.* in Unemployed Insurance for England and Wales and 1,000,000*l.* for Scotland, and 104,000*l.* for the Unemployed Workmen's Act for England and Wales and Scotland. The return is also not up to date. For instance, the figures given in the last issue, 139. 1922, for Poor Law expenditure, 32,000,000*l.* for England and Wales from the rates alone, are those for 1920, while the figures for 1921, 35,700,000*l.* from the rates alone,\* are given in the report of the Ministry of Health published about the same time.† In this connexion we have suggested, not only that later figures were available, but we have also submitted that in future loans and overdrafts should figure under Poor Law expenditure. For instance, the report of an enquiry made this year into the Sheffield Union expenditure showed that the Sheffield Guardians owed no less than 670,000*l.* at the end of September 1921 for money borrowed for expenditure on this relief, and their funded debt at the present time is no less than 400,000*l.*‡ Moreover, the total amount of loans sanctioned in 1921-22, was 4,933,200*l.*§ under the Act of 1887, and apparently 5,819,258*l.* under the Act of 1921, of which 1,220,892*l.* lapsed (p. 88). No statement of this account could be considered accurate which omitted such large items.

We have suggested that it would be an advantage to give the above expenditure in the return and to state in a note how much of it comes from current taxation and current contributions from employers and employed, how much from loans, how much from past accumula-

\* In 1913 the Poor Law expenditure from the rates was 12,060,000*l.* Advocates of Old Age Pensions, etc., declared that they would diminish Poor Law expenditure and close the workhouses, but such measures, according to the law of 'acceleration,' always create more poverty than they provide for. Old Age Pensions for England and Wales cost 18,320,000*l.* in 1921, being in fact outdoor relief from taxes instead of rates.

† Cmd. 1713. 1922. The total expenditure of the Guardians for 1921 was 42,000,000*l.*

‡ Report, p. 7.

§ Cmd. 1713, p. 87.

tions. The public does not appreciate the fact that the unemployment insurance fund is bankrupt,\* any more than it understands that the unemployed insurance scheme has become a scheme of outdoor relief working side by side with a system of outdoor relief under the Poor Law but lacking the essential safeguards of the Poor Law system, namely, expert enquiry into the circumstances of the applicants.

Next as to Housing. The expenditure on Housing is also not up to date. The figures given in the Return, 139. 1922, for Housing as to approximate expenditure are 1,430,000*l.* for England and Wales, and 45,372*l.* for Scotland. These figures are for 1920, but even so they do not appear to be correct, for an answer in Parliament† gives the estimated contributions from the Exchequer towards the annual loss in assisted housing schemes for 1920-21 as 500,000*l.* from the rates and 950,000*l.* from the taxes and 2,528,552*l.* for expenditure under Section 1 of the Housing Additional Powers Act. The same expenditure for 1921-22 is given as 750,000*l.* from the rates and 5,070,000*l.* from the taxes and 4,537,884*l.* under the Housing Additional Powers Act. In addition to this, it appears that for the three years in question, 1920-23, the total expenditure by local authorities is estimated at 185,000,000*l.*‡

We asked in 1918, and we ask again, for a complete statement of the number of the beneficiaries. The heading of the Return, (139. 1922), on the front page states that it gives the total number of persons directly benefiting. If we take this heading seriously and add up the individual totals, they give a grand total of 38,000,000—in fact, nearly 39,000,000—for Great Britain, out of a population of 42,000,000. It is true that a note on page 5 of the Return speaks of many persons receiving under two or more Acts; but this, one may submit, gives no idea of the immense

\* 'The Unemployed Insurance Fund, which began in 1920 with an accumulated surplus of 22,000,000*l.*, will have spent by June 1923, according to the forecast of the Government actuary, that amount together with all current contributions and a further 27,000,000*l.*, borrowed from the Treasury on the security of future subscriptions. In plain terms the fund is bankrupt. . . . Simple relief is masquerading as insurance.'—'Times,' March 8, 1923.

† Hansard, March 5, 1923.

‡ Ibid.

amount of overlapping which must take place if any statistical value is to be attached to the component figures. It should, however, be added that these last are open to criticism. It appears, for instance, of no statistical value to give under the heading of persons benefiting from the Unemployed Insurance Act the number of 9,917,000, which, on reference to the notes, turns out to be the estimated number of persons insured. The average number of the unemployed appears to be not more than one-sixth of this estimated number. To clear up this point we have, in our Petition of Jan. 28, 1923, repeated a suggestion, which we have often made before, that complete figures should be given as to individuals and as to family units, or, better still, that a complete register should be kept to prevent overlapping, waste, and fraud, and we have added in an appendix to the Petition a suggestion we have often made in the columns of the 'Times' and elsewhere, that typical districts should be taken if it should prove impossible to provide this for the whole country.

We gather from Mr Baldwin that he has made some enquiries on these lines, and that he rules out the first suggestion on the ground of expense; while he is not convinced that the second, that of the register, would not be both unpractical and too costly. The Denison House Committee have had before them evidence of a partial system of registration undertaken in London and carried out on a voluntary basis at a comparatively small cost. The experiment has had the desirable result of promoting economy and efficiency and also of exposing fraud. For instance, one man was discovered to be drawing two War Pensions, one in Kensington and the other in Paddington. He was also getting help from the Mayor's Fund, Church Army, Infant Welfare Centre, and a police pension from Eastbourne, and admitted having defrauded the Paddington Guardians as well. This, of course, is an extreme case; but we have many others we could cite. We have suggested to the new Prime Minister, in his capacity of Chancellor of the Exchequer, that certain forms of public relief are of a discretionary character dependent upon the total income of the recipient and therefore closely related, not only to each other, but also to the voluntary

charities; and it is stated that both statutory bodies and voluntary charities have appreciated the value of such registration, both for the prevention of overlapping and for the value of the co-operation made possible between them. Thus Poor Law relief, relief by Borough Councils, relief by education authorities and voluntary charities, have already registered in certain districts with excellent results, and to them might certainly be added Old Age Pensions.

This modified form of registration of relief, while it would not cover the ground, would, we believe, prove of great value if undertaken jointly with voluntary service. We venture to think that it would be a great benefit if a more complete co-operation between statutory public assistance and voluntary charity could be established in this country.\* Such a scheme of registration as is here suggested might well become the nucleus of such a movement, but it should in all cases be introduced tentatively and gradually to avoid any possible waste of public money. We are informed that such a scheme has been adopted in one of the Metropolitan Boroughs at a cost of less than 200*l.* a year, and we suggest that the increased economy and efficiency would justify a still greater outlay. In this connexion the Denison House Committee acknowledges with gratitude the concession Mr Baldwin has made in directing that Government Departments should in future supply information to local authorities and duly accredited organisations in regard to such Government payments as come within the purview of the Prime Minister's Committee.

The need for such a register has for years past been obvious to any reader of the public press, for instances have been given of some families drawing often 4*l.* and 5*l.* a week from overlapping funds and in some cases half as much again. When the limit for the payment of Income Tax is recollected the gross injustice of this abuse will be realised. These two suggestions have the definite support of various public authorities, and the

\* Of the value of the charity which is being discouraged by local extravagance no more eloquent example can be given than the Union of Redruth, where the expenditure of the Guardians for relief of distress due to unemployment was 5000*l.*, while no less than 4000*l.* was provided from voluntary sources (Cmnd. 1713, p. 92).

London County Council, having examined the Petition, has passed a resolution in favour of its proposals.

In addition to asking that the total amount expended and the total number of the beneficiaries should be given in the return, we have again asked in our Petition of Jan. 28, 1923, that administrative cost should be given in greater detail, so that comparisons between different localities could be instituted and some standard of administrative cost set up. During the War a Select Committee on National Expenditure discovered that the administrative cost per 1000 persons insured of National Health Insurance was for England 28*l.*, Wales 5*l.*, Scotland 36*l.*, and Ireland 56*l.* It should be made clear whether this disproportion continues, and if so, to what extent. But information is required for smaller areas.\* In 1915 I persuaded the London County Council to publish a volume of comparative municipal statistics for the principal towns of the United Kingdom, which may serve as a precedent in this regard, and I was assured at the time of its publication that it was of great value to the officers concerned in the administration of those cities.

In addition to the statement of past expenditure we have suggested that an annual estimate of future expenditure should be given in the return for both central and local authorities. Such estimates have been made by the Ministry of Health for Poor Law expenditure throughout the country, and are regularly produced by some County Councils in respect of municipal and educational expenditure. So far as the State accounts are concerned it is idle to refer individuals to the Parliamentary estimates. It is notorious that supplementary estimates are a regular, serious, and annual factor. This complicates matters; but apart from this the estimates themselves as presented and accounts

---

\* (a) For instance, it should be remembered that 'the number of persons in receipt of relief in any Union depends largely on the traditions of the Union, and the methods of administration adopted at the time' (Ministry of Health Report, 1922, Cmd. 1713, p. 81). (b) The proportion per 1000 of the population in receipt of relief among East End Unions on March 25, 1922, in Whitechapel was 26·7, in Mile End Old Town 46·6, and 171·1 at Poplar (Cmd. 1713, p. 90). Speaking of Unions generally, the average weekly maintenance cost of institutional relief per head varied from 35s. 11*d.* to 21s. 9*d.* (p. 93) in 1921-22 in institutions; in infirmaries administered under separate regulations from 68s. 2*d.* to 32s. 3*d.* (p. 93).

rendered are most difficult to understand. The House of Commons Select Committee has stated that no vote or account includes the whole cost of the service to which it refers. Local authorities are, as I have said, in the habit of producing such estimates, and in particular the Guardians are obliged to make an estimate of their expenditure for six months ahead, in order to enable them to issue their precept for poor rate. Moreover, the Finance Committee of the Westminster City Council has recommended the Council to pass a resolution expressing the opinion that all rate-levying authorities should be required to submit to the Ministry of Health each year the total amount proposed to be raised by rate during the next ensuing financial year, in order that information on the matter may be laid before Parliament at the same time as the National Budget. The opinion of the Westminster Finance Committee is that if such information were available Parliament would be in a position to judge whether contemplated expenditure was justified.

In addition to this the London County Council at a recent meeting passed a resolution 'that an annual estimate should be prepared of future expenditure on public assistance for both central and local authorities.' It is hardly necessary to add that no public company and no business man would think of attempting to conduct his business without an accurate annual statement of past expenditure and a careful estimate of future expenditure. There seems no reason why ordinary principles of business should not be applied to public affairs.

Further, the Denison House Committee, in their Petition of Jan. 28, submitted that in view of the present overlapping of the public assistance functions of the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Pensions, the Board of Customs for Old Age Pensions, the Board of Education (e.g. Provision of Meals Act), the Ministry of Labour, and the Ministry of Agriculture for Land Settlement, enquiries should be made whether some more efficient, economical, and convenient form of administration could not be devised by concentrating their public assistance functions under one authority, such as the Commission of Enquiry and Control established in 1834.

In making this proposal the Committee do not, of

course, wish to suggest that the proposed central authority which should exercise supervision and control over the total expenditure on direct public assistance should carry out the detailed administration of the various services concerned. This would obviously in such a scheme be dealt with by various departments as at present, subject only to the general control of expenditure by the central authority. Such control would be analogous to that now exercised by the Treasury over all other central departments; but whereas the Treasury officials have no special technical knowledge of the departments they control, it was hoped that some at any rate of the commissioners would have had experience in social work, and all of them be independent of the disastrous ministerial and political influences of which evidence will be given later on.

The Petition further suggested that the Commission of Control should have power to concentrate the local administration of public assistance following the same precedent. Larger areas are necessary in many cases, and these could be formed by amalgamating existing unions of parishes on the lines suggested many years ago by Sir Arthur Downes and Mr Charles Booth. At present, as we have seen, there are separate administrative units and divisional and inspectorial areas for all the central departments above mentioned. Confusion not only results in overlapping, fraud, and waste of public funds, but also blunts the efficiency and discourages the efforts of local officials and voluntary workers. Such a permanent Commission of Enquiry and Control is urgently needed at the present time both for central and local public assistance. The House of Commons, in the words of the late Speaker, Lord Ullswater, 'has become one of the chief spending departments of the State . . . advocates of economy get no look in.\* This is particularly true as regards public assistance, and the debates all through the last Parliament show the extreme reluctance on the part of Members to vote against such expenditure.

On April 4, 1922, a proposal was made in the House of Commons to add 15,000,000*l.* to the 26,000,000*l.* already annually paid for Old Age Pensions. The then Chancellor

---

\* Select Committee on National Expenditure, p. 122.

of the Exchequer complained of the absence of support due to him from those who habitually lectured him on economy, and he concluded by saying :

'In fact, to-day has produced something like a microcosm of the attitude of the House towards questions of expenditure. It spent a whole afternoon denouncing the Government because of supposed extravagance, and the whole evening in urging the Government to spend another 15,000,000*l.* a year. It stares one in the face that a considerable part of this expenditure is to go to people who do not require it and do not deserve it.'

On May 5, 1922, the same Chancellor said :

'A number of votes may influence a member of the House of Commons. Whatever the influences are you discover that those who shout loudest for obtaining economies are the most ready to vote away public money because particular objects come up in which they think their popularity is involved.'

It is not only sniping of this kind from which the Government, to whatever party it may belong, will have to be defended. There are always proposals of fresh expenditure, such as that for Mothers' Pensions which involved an enormous addition to the annual expenditure of the country, and to which Members of Parliament are ready enough to give lip service in the fond belief that it will gain them votes, and that the expenditure will never in fact materialise. As to Mothers' Pensions, the representative of the Government, now Financial Secretary to the Treasury, said on March 3, 1923, 'The scheme would cost over 20,000,000*l.* in the course of a few years, and, on the basis of Widows' Pensions, the cost would be 50,000,000*l.* The saving in Poor Law relief would be very small indeed.'

Such a Commission would give a reliable estimate of the Bills before Parliament and of future expenditure, which the late Speaker suggested in his memorandum, for the Select Committee on National Expenditure could not be obtained from existing departments. As regards local authorities, a public enquiry recently established the fact that in one Union 100,000*l.* a year could be saved, but there is apparently no adequate means of compelling this waste to cease.

Mr Bonar Law in the course of February appointed

a Committee to consider in what way the fullest co-ordination of administrative and executive action could be secured in regard to public assistance on account of sickness, unemployment, and destitution, and Mr Baldwin has assured us that any recommendations the Committee may make on this matter will receive careful consideration. We must await the publication of the report and the decision of the Government thereon before taking any further steps. Meanwhile, we may observe that, so far as economy and efficiency are concerned, it is not entirely a matter of the responsibility of the ratepayers and local administration. For instance, it seems doubtful whether the power to check excessive out-relief really rests in all cases with the ratepayers who have to bear the whole cost of it. For instance, in London, out-relief has to some extent been made a charge on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, with the result that the ratepayers of the contributing boroughs have to provide for out relief for boroughs in which they are not represented, and in which they have no power of checking excess. Moreover, as a recent enquiry has shown, in some cases two Unions run institutions jointly and one partner cannot control the extravagance of the other.

Apart from Boards of Guardians, Exchequer grants have in other departments had the effect of stimulating local extravagance, for extravagance takes a different aspect when some one else has to pay for it. For the moment, therefore, reformers must concentrate on the fact that the public has the right to a strict up-to-date account being given in an accessible form of all expenditure, central and local, on direct public assistance; for it is only by the publication of such an account that the country can obtain an accurate idea of the vast and ever-increasing cost of legislation on these matters and the urgent need of some check on that cost. It is the bankruptcy of the central and local government that is to be avoided.

I have not left myself space to deal at length with the fact that the present lavish expenditure of public money is demoralising alike to the recipient \* and to the

\* A complete article might be written on the overlapping of various forms of relief, and in particular on the frauds connected with the dole,

poorer ratepayers and taxpayers. There are still many independent persons of small means who refuse to barter their independence and who are in a worse position than some persons who draw their subsistence entirely from public funds. There is a still larger class always on the verge of pauperism, and to them the temptation of competing with their neighbours for relief appeals very strongly. The most lamentable fact is the extension of the disease of pauperism to the young, as well as to the adult and aged poor. Indeed, recent enquiries in the East End and in the provinces have shown that unemployed doles are having disastrous moral results on young people of both sexes. As a last resort, however, the responsibility, as I suggested to the Denison House Committee in December 1917, falls on the public at large; and in this view I am supported by no less a person than the present Prime Minister, who made, when Secretary to the Treasury, the following statement in the House of Commons:

'If the Government was extravagant no Chancellor of the Exchequer and no Treasury could prevent it. The Government was dependent on the House, and if the House did not attempt to hold the Government in check, that Government would go on spending money. The House, however, was dependent on the people, and the ultimate arbiter of expenditure was the voter.\*'

Reform, it appears, is eventually certain owing to the inexorable pressure of financial necessity, and the longer it takes the harder it will be in every sense for all concerned. But one must not expect too much from a Government which is faced by the imperious urgency of pressing imperial and foreign questions, as well as domestic problems, like those connected with Rent Restriction. It took nineteen years to convince the country, after Waterloo, of the vital character of the reform they are now needing, and those of us who have set our hands to this task have now been at work for over ten years. Perhaps another nine years of equally arduous work are before us. We have at any rate solid ground for hope in the fact that, as the Petition recently

---

and its use for drink, betting, char-à-banc rides, as an income in lieu of work, and an income on which to marry.

\* Hansard, March 6, 1919.

presented to the Prime Minister shows, we have an immense amount of influential support in the country. We have a good sound case which, when generally made known, will, we believe, appeal to all self-respecting Englishmen, for the independence of the working classes and the solvency of the country are at stake.

To sum up, the case for the Petition rests on the impregnable position that the Government should render an accurate account of the public money annually spent and proposed to be spent on public assistance. It rests on the fact that an immense sum now spent from the rates and taxes could be saved and a proportionate fillip thereby given to trade and industry. It rests on the conviction that the country should be preserved from the vexatious, oppressive, and arbitrary regulations which a ring of officials (a mediæval baronage returned to power) are imposing on every class of the community. It rests on the fact that a very large number of the undeserving among the beneficiaries would soon be diminished by a proper system of deterrence, and absorbed, as in 1834, in the wage-earning population. It rests above all on the consideration due to those members of the working classes who are striving with untold fortitude to maintain themselves and their families without public relief.\* We are fighting for the spirit of self-reliance and freedom from which, under Providence, our country draws its inspiration and its strength.

‘ Yet Freedom, yet, thy banner torn but flying,  
Streams like the thunderstorm against the wind,  
Thy trumpet voice, though broken now and dying,  
The loudest still the tempest leaves behind.’

GEOFFREY DRAGE.

\* Their case was stated before the Commission of 1834 by an agricultural labourer, Mr Thomas Pearce of Govington, Sussex. Question : How have you managed to live without parish relief? Answer : By working hard. Question : What do the paupers say to you? Answer : They blame me for what I do. They say, ‘ If you didn’t do it you would get the same as another man has, and would get your money for smoking your pipe and doing nothing.’ It is a hard thing for a man like me. (First Report of Commissioners, p. 72.)

## Art. 18.—THE CHURCH AND THE PRAYER-BOOK.

ONE of the hardest problems which have exercised the brains of constitutional lawyers, and vexed the hearts of religious enthusiasts, throughout the ages, has been that which sought to settle what part the Civil Power should play in regard to religious affairs. An extreme theory of State control has taken its title from the Hellenised name assumed by a Swiss theologian of the 16th century, whose almost forgotten writings, it would seem, scarcely warrant his identification with the theory in question. Be that as it may, the name has come into conventional use—whether as a term of respect or of opprobrium—to describe a doctrine which claims supreme authority for the State over the religious community.

The crudest and most brutal exposition of this so-called Erastian principle has been enunciated, once for all, by David Hume, with a force of pungent irony that is all his own. It is thus that he sets it forth, when treating of the ecclesiastical state of England under Henry VIII :

' Most of the arts and professions in a State are of such a nature, that, while they promote the interests of the Society, they are also useful or agreeable to some individuals ; and in that case, the constant rule of the magistrate, except, perhaps on the first introduction of any art, is to leave the profession to itself, and trust its encouragement to those who reap the benefit of it. . . Yet there are also some callings, which, though useful, and even necessary in a State, bring no particular advantage or pleasure to any individual ; and the supreme power is obliged to alter its conduct with regard to the retainers of those professions. It must give them public encouragement, in order to their subsistence ; and it must provide against that negligence, to which they will naturally be subject, either by annexing peculiar honours to the profession, by establishing a long subordination of ranks and a strict dependence, or by some other expedient. The persons employed in the finances, armies, fleets, and magistracy, are instances of this order of men.

' It may naturally be thought, at first sight, that the ecclesiastics belong to the first class, and that their encouragement, as well as that of lawyers and physicians, may safely be entrusted to the liberality of individuals who are attached to their doctrines, and who find benefit or consolation from

their spiritual ministry and assistance. Their industry and vigilance will, no doubt, be whetted by such an additional motive; and their skill in their profession, as well as their address in governing the minds of the people, must receive daily increase from their increasing practice, study, and attention.

'But if we consider the matter more closely, we shall find that this interested diligence of the clergy is what every wise legislator will study to prevent; because in every religion, except the true, it is highly pernicious, and it has even a natural tendency to pervert the true, by infusing into it a strong mixture of superstition, folly, and delusion. Each ghostly practitioner, in order to render himself more precious and sacred in the eyes of his retainers, will inspire them with the most violent abhorrence of all other sects, and continually endeavour, by some novelty, to excite the languid devotion of his audience. No regard will be paid to truth, morals, or decency, in the doctrines inculcated. Every tenet will be adopted that best suits the disorderly affections of the human frame. Customers will be drawn to each conventicle by new industry and address, in practising on the passions and credulity of the populace. And, in the end, the civil magistrate will find, that he has paid dearly for his pretended frugality, in saving a fixed establishment for the priests: and that, in reality, the most decent and advantageous composition which he can make with the spiritual guides, is to bribe their indolence, by assigning stated salaries to their profession, and rendering it superfluous for them to be further active, than merely to prevent their flock from straying in quest of new pastures. And in this manner ecclesiastical establishments, though commonly they arose at first from religious views, prove in the end advantageous to the political interests of Society.'

The sarcastic cynicism of Hume led him to propound a theory which, for all its apparent seriousness, is really nothing more than a witty paradox. It is probably true of no country and of no age, even although the politician may sometimes find it necessary to watch vigilantly for symptoms of that danger which Hume thinks likely to arise. It has certainly never been true as regards the attitude of the politician to the Church in this country. The Civil Government, with us, however drastic may have been its interference with ecclesiastical affairs, has never attempted to assume the attitude of lofty and

contemptuous indifference, which regards the Church as an inferior agent, whose eccentricities must be controlled, and whose excess of energy must be curbed. When the Civil Power has intervened, in England, in ecclesiastical affairs, it has always been as the avowed adherent of one party in the Church, and as the champion of one type of religious thought. As soon as the State ceases to have a definite creed, and relapses into an attitude of indifference, it is apt to be ready to abandon its own magisterial control, and to welcome complete severance between Church and State. That is a course which involves quite as many dangers as the exercise of a dominant control under a trenchant system of Erastianism. We believe that to the vast majority of our countrymen that complete severance, which must lead to a creedless State, and to a Church uncontrolled by law, is just as unwelcome as would be the dominant Erastianism paradoxically described by Hume.

In this country we have never taken kindly to the undue exercise of magisterial control. But it is none the less true that the love of order and of seemly discipline has entered deeply into the religious life of England, and is one of its most permanent instincts. At first that instinct seemed to justify very drastic penalties upon breaches of the old order, and very ruthless methods of dealing with Dissenters. All that has passed away, and every remnant alike of penal action, and of refusal of civil equality, has long since been swept out of the Statute Book. But the old love and reverence remain. Those who disagree may hive off, and form new communities. But the nation has taken to its heart, its own Historic Church with all its traditions, and the seemliness of its ritual. It stands for something too deep and too sacred to mould itself to every breath of mood and fashion.

The national characteristic love of order has shown itself in very different shapes throughout our history. The Erastian principle probably never took a sterner form than in the Act of the 1st Year of Queen Elizabeth which stands first in our Prayer-books. It is no part of our purpose now to trace the steps in the development of our Church Establishment, and the evolution of our Liturgy. But that famous Act is a startling display of

the assertion by the Civil power of an authority over the Church which is absolutely without bounds. It is true that, in that Act, the Church is buttressed in its supremacy over any other creed. Every citizen is compelled to attend its ministrations, is subject to its discipline, and must breathe no whisper of dissent from its creeds. But what these creeds and tenets are, and what forms are to be observed in these ministrations, is prescribed by the Civil power with minute detail, and the prescription must be followed to the letter. The secular struggle between Church and State had at length culminated in a victory for the Civil power, which was asserted with ruthless severity; and the Act of Queen Elizabeth was really the paean of that victory. The note of dominancy was none the less clear and distinct from the fact that its assertion was made by the Civil power in close alliance with the adherents of the Reformed doctrine.

The Act of 1559 reflected all the fierceness of the struggle which it attempted to end. Its terms and its provisions naturally strike us, after nearly four centuries, as strangely out of harmony with that liberty which we claim as our inheritance. Yet it was drafted in the lifetime of many whose thoughts and ideas dominate us even at the present day; and it was accepted by them as a sound and salutary measure. The terms in which it was imposed were indeed imperious; but, for all that, it did much to shape the architecture, and to inspire the genius, of our Anglican Church.

But let us travel down another century of history, and come to the Uniformity Act of 1662. From that Act the note of domineering triumph on the part of the State has disappeared. The Act of Elizabeth had marked the decisive defeat of independent ecclesiastical authority. From the creeds and forms of that ecclesiastical authority no changes were to be made except those necessary to check its reassertion of independence. But, changed or unchanged, the creeds and forms were to derive their authority from the State and not from the Church.

The Act of 1662 was something very different. It came to heal the rents in the tabernacle, and to repair its altars. Its dominant note was one of peace and of com-

promise. The spirit of its promoters is best seen in the Preface, which also appears in our Prayer-book, and contains passages which are almost racy in their quiet insinuation of a balance between rigid adherence to old form, and too impulsive zeal for change. 'It has been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her Public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting, any variations from it.' Changes may doubtless be necessary; but they are apt, at the best, to produce inconveniences just as great as those they were meant to remove. 'Some changes tendered to us . . . we have willingly, and of our own accord, assented unto: not enforced to do so by any strength of argument, convincing us of the necessity of said alterations'—but only because on the whole it was expedient not to be 'too stiff in refusing.'

That is the spirit in which the work was done, and it was enjoined in language which is separated by a wide gulf from that of Elizabeth's Act of 1559. That Act was the stern proclamation of a sovereign, determined to assert her supreme authority over subjects whose whims and caprices demanded strict control. The Act of 1662 was the effort of a statesman, striving, after a time of anarchy and disorder, to restore the stately edifice of the Church, and to adjust her *formulae* so as to preserve all essentials, and at the same time to make non-essentials conform to the reasonable susceptibilities of tender consciences. It was the charter bequeathed by Clarendon to the Church, and it reflected that character in the Anglican Establishment, with which Clarendon, more than any other man, inspired her.

What, then, are the chief elements in the genius which the Church has thus inherited, and to which the instinct of self-preservation teaches her to cling? They have grown out of the experiences of her history, and they have imbibed the promptings of the nation's best imagination, and of its profoundest feeling. That feeling and that imagination have clothed themselves, as with a garment, in the beauty and magic music of the language of the Church's Liturgy. That inheritance is a priceless treasure; and they who heedlessly tamper with it will

have to meet a heavy reckoning if their tactless handling of it should impair its inestimable grace.

First, as has been said, that Liturgy is the fruit of historic experience. It has wisely preserved the long-drawn traditions of ritual and language inimitable in their consummate art. But it has, definitely and of set purpose, laid aside certain parts of that ancient ritual, because these parts contained the germ of certain ecclesiastical usurpations which a long fight taught us to be inconsistent with the genius of our people. This is not the place to canvas the merits of the Church of Rome, as contrasted with the Reformed Churches. We do not seek to appraise these merits, nor do we presume to condemn the judgment of those Englishmen who adhere to the Roman Catholic Church. All that we do assert is that the history of the Anglican Church has, by the irresistible force of time and experience, made the very existence of that Church, as a separate entity, which has entwined itself with the history of the country, depend vitally upon resistance to those ecclesiastical assumptions which are essentially opposed to the trend of English thought. If we are not convinced of this we have no right to stand apart from the Papal Church. If we are convinced of it, then we must keep out of the Liturgy of our Church those elements which, being present, either mean nothing or involve submission to those ecclesiastical claims which centuries of history have proved to be alien to the spirit of our race. We are not discussing their theological soundness. The Anglican establishment is the fruit of history; and it must reflect the national historic character, or it has no right to claim a separate existence. Let us have no subterfuges as to the issue involved, and no glozing of it by ambiguous words.

We have to look jealously at any proposals for tampering with the ancient liturgical forms of our Church. Changes are dangerous, and that for two very different reasons. The first is, that such changes may impart into our Liturgy some *formulae* implicitly involving ecclesiastical pretensions which, whatever their origin, the history of the English nation has definitely rejected. As to this, there must be no misunderstanding. The issues which are involved are exactly the same

as those which were the subject of a long-drawn and vigorously fought struggle in the 16th century. England will not renew that struggle. She has definitely pronounced upon it, once for all; and she refuses to turn back that page of history. We give all respect to those who adhere to the faith of the Papal Church. We gladly admit their high claims to consideration, and we refuse to them no political privilege. But that is because the genius of our political spirit is a generous one: not one whit because we are less strenuous than our forefathers in our resistance to those of their tenets which we hold to be irreconcilable with modern habits of thought, and the boon of intellectual independence.

The second reason is of a very different kind. It has nothing to do with doctrine, or with any views as to ecclesiastic supremacy. It belongs perhaps rather to the sphere of artistic taste, and of imaginative enthusiasm; but it is none the less very real, and very dear to the heart of every Englishman. The beauty of our English Liturgy is an inheritance to which we cling with a devotion that deepens as the years go by. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the influence which that liturgy has in holding close together those 'kindred points' of Heaven and Home. What has that Liturgy, with its measured cadence, its magic harmony, its marvellous grace of rhythm, been as a call from home to the lonely exile, throughout all our far-flung borders? That consummate art of composing devotional forms, of which our forbears in the 16th and 17th centuries were past-masters, has vanished from the breasts of our present spiritual guides and pastors as completely as the vivid colouring of 13th-century glass has deserted our artificers. Their modern efforts at devotional composition are hard working and praiseworthy, but they lamentably fail to stir any echo in our hearts.

That sacred treasure we would fain preserve, and hand on to our sons, with all its perfect music unimpaired. Have our ardent revisers fully measured what it means, and what it has imparted to every Englishman? Do they think how much of a bulwark it has been against the inroads of modern 'journalese' and all the pestilent brood of phrasemongers and adepts in the freshest products of the mint of slang? Is it not in

*the RED FLAG*

the mirror of our Liturgy that we have our vision opened, even as our ears might be touched by an ancient lingering melody, to the memory of what our language once was, and what Providence intended it to be? Let us say it with all courtesy, and yet with all firmness, we are not prepared to entrust the custody of that sacred inheritance to the tender mercies of the perfervid ecclesiastical innovator, or to the tasteless energies of the clerical publication agent. These lively innovators seem to conceive the Liturgies of our Church to be a suitable sphere of experiment in search of a cheap tinsel work of self-advertisement. It is to be hoped that the good sense of the nation will warn them off the ground.

We have to guard against changes in our Liturgy that involve serious doctrinal issues. For these we trust that the common sense of the nation will provide a sufficient bulwark. But let us beware also of changes prompted by a specious desire to make concessions to the deity of fashion. We must change, forsooth, because certain expressions are out of harmony with modern habits of thought, and are perhaps not familiar to those who have been saturated with the language of the yellow press or with the jargon of the music-hall. This type of reviser is familiar to all of us: that of the self-proclaimed champion of broadminded thought and complacent alertness who points to us the sure road to spiritual aspiration in the abandonment of all the old-fashioned rigmarole that pleased our fathers, but has grown tedious to the fastidious ears of their sons. 'Forget these lingering strains of music, and let us hammer out a new language from the slang of the gutter. That way lies new spiritual conquest!' And the strange thing is, that they have their allies amongst our spiritual pastors, and even on the Episcopal Bench.

We are far from saying that certain modifications and revision of our Liturgy may not, as a concession to those whose susceptibilities are offended by archaisms which they find harsh or unintelligible, be not only justified but highly expedient. We cannot attach the same importance to these archaisms as those nicer critics seem to do; but we would be unwilling to give them reason for offence. We are inclined to adopt the wise and balanced language of the Preface of 1662.

'We are,' it says, 'fully persuaded in our judgments (and we here profess it to the world) that the Book, as it stood before established by law, doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the Word of God, or to sound doctrine, or which a godly man may not with a good conscience use and submit unto . . . if it shall be allowed such just and favourable construction *as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human writings.*'

But with this reservation, the composers of that Preface are ready to 'do that which to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of Peace and Unity in the Church'; and so, for convenience, but not as a matter of supreme moment, they are ready to make some alterations. By all means let us follow that good example. But do not let us shut our eyes to the dangers even of these minor alterations. Remember that if you alter or recast a phrase, you commit yourself to absolute approval of the new form of words. Our ears accommodate themselves to phraseology that is odd or bizarre, if it comes to us mellowed by time, sanctified by long and hallowed associations, and rendered harmonious by the artistry of long usage. Alter that phraseology to suit your own critical tastes, and you bind yourselves implicitly to each detail of the new phrase, and must expect to find yourselves in your turn criticised by those to whom your form of words commands none of the respect born of immemorial tradition. Change is easy: it is not so easy to guard against the caprices of passing taste. One thing we ought certainly to bar very definitely, if we are not to destroy the essential unity of the life of the Anglican Church. On no account will the great lay body in the Church tolerate uncertainty as to our Liturgy, and that those forms of worship which have become absorbed into their very life, are to be subject to arbitrary choice on the part of the officiating clergymen. We can have no alternative Liturgies. We have had far too much of this already; and that it has been allowed to prevail so extensively is a proof of the strange incapacity often evinced by the clerical mind for grasping the moods or commanding the sympathies of their lay fellow citizens. If need be, propose your alterations and revisions. If they are wise and moderate they will find probably

no serious opposition. But let them not trench upon essentials of doctrine, or you will provoke stern resistance. And let them not pretend to alter the primary characteristic of our Church in its unbroken and consistent unity. In our Liturgy we have a great heritage: we will not suffer its consummate beauty to be tarnished by those who ape the language of the market-place, or its solemn majesty to be infringed by the enticements of a capricious variety. Let us not forget that we are moving in a very vague and uncertain atmosphere when we suffer ourselves to be guided by the whimsical moods of ecclesiastical fashion. Its caprices are beyond all possibility of calculation. The only thing that we can safely predict is that none of them will last long.

We can have no such dyarchy in the Church as would be involved in the use of alternative Liturgies. In the political field that ill-conceived plan has worked havoc enough; in religion it would mean the substitution of anarchy and confusion for comely and disciplined order. And still more there can be no compromise with those extremists on either side whose avowed aim it is to bend the traditional development of our Anglican Church in the direction of their own peculiar tenets. It has become clear to the minds of unbiased laymen that there is, especially, on one side, an almost avowed defiance of that law, by virtue of which they hold both their temporal position and their ecclesiastical authority. England has no love for a rigid Erastianism, and has no wish to base the relations between State and Church upon its principles. But she does highly regard the virtues and the benefits of orderly discipline, and of clear and unreserved loyalty to those standards and traditions which we are proud to have inherited.

